Rural Development (Eleventh Lok Sabha) on Mega City Scheme.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that a Fax message has been received from Shri Chimanbhai Haribhai Shukla stating that he is suffering from chronic bronchitis and he is unable to attend the House during the current Session upto 19th March, 1999. He has, therefore, requested for the grant of Leave of Absence for the First Phase of current session of the Rajya Sabha upto 19th March, 1999.

Does he have the permission of the House for remaining absent from the sittings of the House for the First Phase of the current session of the Rajya Sabha upto 19th March, 1999?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

Now, we take up further discussion on the Short Duration Discussion on the issues raised by the former Advisor to the Finance Minister and alleged improprieties arising there from raised by Dr. Manmohan Singh on the 13th March, 1999. Shri Jitendra Prasada.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Issues Raised by former advisor to the Finance Minister and the alleged Improprieties arising therefrom—contd.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति महोदय, पिछले दिन इस चर्चा के दौरान मैं यह कह रहा था कि सत्ताधारी दल जिस तरह का रवैया इस मसले पर अपना रहा है, उस से मालूम होता है कि जो तथ्य समाचारपत्रों में, जनता के सामने और इस सदन के सामने आए हैं, उसमें कुछ छिपाने की कोशिश की जा रही है।

महोदय, 11 महीने के शासनकाल में सत्ताधारी दल की तरफ से हमेशा यह प्रचार किया गया कि इस अवधि के दौरान किसी किस्म के भ्रष्टाचार की शिकायत नहीं आई और हालांकि इन की पार्टी में डिफरेंसेस थे, लेकिन चुनाव से पहले और चुनाव के बाद पार्टी डिफरेंसेस से इंकार किया गया और जोर-जोर से नैतिकता की दुहाई दी गयी और जब यह आरोप लगे तब इनको टालने की, संसद के सदनों में बहस से बचाने की पूरे तरीके से कोशिश की गई।

सभापति महोदय, आपको मालूम है कि किस तरीके से दबाव बनाया गया, किस तरीके से आपसे अनुरोध किया गया और आपने यहां इस पर बहस कराने का निर्णय लिया। प्रधान मंत्री जी खुद इसी सदन में कहते थे कि हम कुछ छिपाना नहीं चाहते। हमारा भी सिर्फ यही निवेदन है कि जो तथ्य प्रकाशित हुए हैं, उस पर जानकारी मिले। यह तथ्य हमने नहीं प्रकाशित कराए, हमने कोई आपके ऊपर आरोप नहीं लगाए बल्कि आप ही के सलाहकार, आप ही के विश्वास-पात्र, आप ही की पार्टी के सदस्य, आप ही की पार्टी के वह सदस्य जिन्होंने मैनिफेस्टो बनाया, आपके जो मीडिया एडवाइजार थे, उन्हीं ने यह सारे तथ्य प्रकाशित किए हैं, इंटरव्यू दिए हैं। मेरी समझ में सरकार जो पारदर्शिता की बात कहती है, अगर उस पर अमल करती तो जैसे ही यह इंटरव्यू छपे, वित्त मंत्री जी को यहां पर सदन में एक सू-मोटो स्टेटमेंट लेकर आना चाहिये था और सारे तथ्यों को सदन के सामने बताना चाहिए था। आज आप जितना भी कुछ कहते रहें, जैसा आपने एक सदन में कहा कि अगर मेरे ऊपर आरोप सिद्ध होता है तो मैं इस्तीफा दे दूंगा, लेकिन इससे बात हल होने वाली नहीं है।

सभापति महोदय, बहुत सी गंभीर बातें इन इंटरव्यू में कही गई हैं, जिनको मेरे और साथियों ने भी जिक्र किया है। मैं भी कुछ आपका ध्यान इन बातों की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं। हमारे लायक साथी अरुण शौरी जी यहां बैठे हैं, इन्होंने इस इंटरव्यू की तुलना वह जो एसियन एज में, जिस पर प्रिवीलेज मोशन हमने मूव किया था हमारे कपिल सिब्बल साहब ने, उसे कर दी है। वह तो एक समाचार प्रकाशित हुआ था सीबीआई की एक चिट्ठी को लेकर, जिसको कि सीबीआई ने खुद ही डिनाइ कर दिया था, उस चिट्ठी के आधार पर प्रकाशित हुआ था और उसमें कुछ लोगों के बारे में कुछ संबंध होना, कुछ आरोप होना, यह आया था। उसकी तुलना अगर इससे की जाती है तो यह उचित नहीं है। यह तो सत्ताधारी दल के एक एडवाइजर, वित्त मंत्री के एडवाइजर, वित्त मंत्री के विश्वास-पात्र, उस दल के एक विश्वास-पात्र सदस्य जो थे, उनके इंटरव्यू हैं, उनके साक्षात्कार हैं और इसलिए इसकी तुलना उससे अगर की जाती है तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह इंसाफ की बात बिल्कुल नहीं है।

सभापति महोदय, मोटे तौर पर मैं यह कहूंगा कि मोहन गुरुस्वामी जी ने दो तीन बातें उठाई हैं। एक तो बहुत ही गंभीर जो आर्थिक निर्णय हुए हैं उनको उन्होंने गलत बताया है और हजारों करोड़ के निर्णय ऐसे हो गए हैं, जिनसे भारतीय कंपनियों और विदेशी कंपनियों को कुछ फायदा होने की बात उन्होंने अपने इंटरव्यू में इंगित की है। यह एक गंभीर बात है। प्रधान मंत्री जी हमेशा घाटे की बात कहते हैं, गरीब की बात कहते हैं कमजोर समाज की बात कहते हैं, मगर इधर सरकार में, सत्ता में बैठे हुए लोग हैं, वह इस तरीके से निर्णय ले रहे हैं, जिससे फायदा भारतीय उद्योगपतियों, विदेशी उद्योगपतियों को पहुंचने का संदेह हो रहा है। सरकार के निर्णय और उसके कामकाज के निर्णय के तरीके का काफी उन्होंने उल्लेख किया है। वहां क्या होता है, हमारे मंत्रि-परिषद् के सदस्य क्या कर रहे हैं, इसका जिक्र किया है और पोट्टी के बारे में जिक्र किया है। यह पोट्टी क्या है? पोट्टी के बारे में उन्होंने जो इंटरव्यू दिया है, मैं उसको भी उद्धृत करना चाहता था कि इस पोट्टी के बारे में यदि यह बात सही है तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक गंभीर विषय है और इसकी जानकारी सदन को मिलनी चाहिये कि क्या एकस्ट्रा कंस्टीट्यूशनल पावर भी यहां पर है, जो इस सरकार को चला रहे हैं। वह कौन है, किस हद तक हैं, क्या उनकी क्वालिफिकेशन है, इसकी जानकारी सरकार को देनी चाहिये। यह बात उनके इंटरव्यू में है, जो कि 11 मार्च के एसियन एज में छपा है, जिसमें वह कहते हैं—

> "Mr. Guruswamy, recently Advisor to the Finance Minister, Mr. Yashwant Sinha, has said, A coterie around the Prime Minster, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, headed by his adopted son-in-law meddling in crucial Government decisions."

मान्यवर, यह एक गंभीर बात है। इस पर पर्दा डालने की कोशिश की जाये या इसको छिपाने की कोशिश की जाए, वह नहीं चलेगा। अगर समाचार पत्र में ऐसे ही छापा गया होता या किसी विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों ने आरोप लगाए होते तो आप जवाब नहीं देते या इसे छिपाने की कोशिश करते, मगर आपके बीच में रहे एक वरिष्ठ अधिकारी, जहां निर्णय लिया जाता था वहां बैठते थे, वहां वह एडवाइस करते थे और जब वही इस तरह की बात करते हैं तो इससे आप बच नहीं सकते, इसलिए आपको इसमें कोई न कोई सफाई लेकर आना ही चाहिये।

मान्यवर, मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि लोकतंत्र के इतने लम्बे इतिहास में कई प्रधान मंत्री हुए, कई सरकारें आई, मगर यह शायद पहला वाक्या होगा इतिहास में कि एक ऐडवाइजर, वित्त मंत्री का ऐडवाइजर हो, उसने सरकार के ऊपर अटैक किया हो और सरकार के ऊपर एक सीरियस अटैक एक सैंसेटिव पोस्ट पर बैठे हुए एक व्यक्ति ने किया है। मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि अगर इसी तरीके के एप्वाइंटमेंट हुए हैं तो क्या और जगह भी इसी तरीके से एप्वाइंटमेंट किए गए हैं? कहां-कहां एप्वाइंटमेंट हुए हैं और अगर एप्वाइंटमेंट में गैर जिम्मेदारी बरती गई है तो क्या देश आपके हाथों में सुरक्षित है? इतनी सैंसेटिव जगहों पर आप इस तरह से एप्वाइंटमेंट कर रहे हैं जो आपके ऊपर कीचड़ उछाल रहे हैं। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि एक बहुत ही गंभीर बात इसमें उन्होंने कही है जो आडवाणी जी और वाजपेयी जी का विवाद है, उस बारे में । इस विवाद की चर्चा बराबर चलती आ रही है। और इसी सदन में कई बार कहा जा चुका है कि हमारा कोई विवाद नहीं है। अगर इस पूरे इंटरव्यू को आप पढ़े तो यह विवाद हर जगह झलककर आता है। अभी कल के "हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स" में एक इंटरव्यू दिया है मोहन गुरुस्वामी जी ने, पहले उन्होंने "एशियन एज" में दिया था, "इंडियन एक्सप्रैस" में दिया था, मगर कल के हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में उन्होंने कहा है, उनसे सवाल किया गया:—

> "You have also indicated partnership by the Prime Minister in steel involving Essar and Mittals and Hindujas."

जवाब में जाता है:—

> "Vajpayee was partisan as far as L.K. Advani was concerned. He was trying to put Advani and Sinha on the mat. At one point, he said, You people are interfering (by drawing up a package for Essar). At the same instant, this Man Friday Pramod Mahajan speaks for the other fellow (M. Mittal)."

प्रमोद महाजन जी आज यहां पर मौजूद नहीं है। उस दिन उनका नाम नहीं लिया गया था, मगर वे काफी उद्वेलित हुए थे, उन्होंने एक जवाब दिया था, मगर जो कल के "हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स" में इंटरव्यू है, उसमें साफ तौर से उनका नाम लिया गया है। फिर आगे क्या होता है:—

> "How was the P.M. using this to upstage Advani? Conveying to

> Advani that you are not above all. Advani's big thing is his image. There was a risk of default abroad (by Essar). And we were only attending to it. If we did not, that would have been very stupid."
>
> But this, oneupmanship between Vajpayee and Advani, how is it affecting the Government? This is very important....

आपके डिफरेंसिस बहुत हैं आपके दल के अंदर, हमको उनसे कोई लेना-देना नहीं है, आप खूब लड़े-झगड़ें, जो मर्जी चाहे करें, हमें कुछ लेना-देना नहीं है, मगर सरकार को जब रिप्रेज़ेंट करते हैं तो हमको लेना-देना है और हम आपसे पूछेंगे और ये लिखते हैं जवाब में, गुरुस्वामी जी क्या कहते हैं—

> "Down the line, there is a partnership. Look at how Vajpayee made N.K. Singh, about whom Advani and Sinha have a low opinion, his Principal Economic Aide in PMO. Vajpayee has been deliberately provoking Advani. Advani was kept ignorant or....".

और एक लम्बी-चौड़ी बात कही गई है और कई जगहों पर इन्होंने इस विवाद के बारे में उल्लेख किया है जिससे सरकार के ऊपर एक गंभीर आरोप, सरकार के निर्णयों के ऊपर एक गंभीर प्रश्नचिन्ह लगता है। यह राम-लक्ष्मण की जोड़ी कही जाती थी, नैतिकता और आदर्शवाद की दुहाई दी जाती थी पहले और जब आप सत्ता में आते हैं तो यह आपकी नैतिकता है, यह आदर्शवाद है और यह राम-लक्ष्मण की जोड़ी का इतिहास है, जो लिखा जा रहा है, जो आपके सामने पेश किया जा रहा है? इन दोनों के बीच में यह भी हुआ है, फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब कैसे एप्वाइंट किए गए? ये फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर नहीं बनने जा रहे थे, एक और साहब बनने जा रहे थे, फिर प्रधान मंत्री खुद बनने जा रहे थे और फिर ये बने। फाइनेंस सैक्रेटरी कैसे एप्वाइंट हुए, यह भी उसमें उद्धृत किया गया है। अगर ये सब बातें एक सैंसेटिव पोस्ट पर बैठा अधिकारी, जिसको इन सब बातों की जानकारी है, कहे तो यह एक बहुत ही गंभीर विषय है और इससे पता लगता है कि सरकार की कार्य-प्रणाली कैसी है। इन सब बातों का असर सरकार के चरित्र पर पड़ रहा है, आप महसूस करें या न करें।

अरुण शौरी जी, मैं फिर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा। एक ज़माना था अरुण शौरी जी का बहुत बड़ा एक क्रेज़ था कॉमन एम०पी० और इनके एक दोस्त का। नीडल आफ सस्पीशन, नीडल आफ सस्पीशन हमने आपके लेखों में ही पढ़ा था और नीडल आफ सस्पीशन का बड़ा ज़ोर था। आपके दोस्त भी नीडल ऑफ सस्पीशन की बात कर रहे थे मगर मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहूंगा कि नीडल आॅफ सस्पीशन जो है....(**व्यवधान**)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): My complaint is, there is only suspicion, no needle. There is only suspicion cast without a needle, and that phrase was not mine. It was Justice Thakkar's phrase. Please don't attribute it to me. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: In whatever way you may interpret it; but this was a phrase which was used by you and your friend, Guruswamy, many times. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: It was used by Justice Thakkar, appointed by you. *(Interruptions)*

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: आज जो वह शक की सुई है, आज वह घूमी है प्रधानमंत्री की तरफ इस सरकार की तरफ कॉटरी की तरफ और वित्त मंत्री की तरफ और देश में एक मज़ाक हो रहा है। सभापति महोदय, यहां पर मंत्रालय जो है उनके नाम बदल दिए गए हैं—*

...(**व्यवधान**) ये इस तरीके का मज़ाक आज देश के अंदर चल रहा है....(**व्यवधान**)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka) : sir, this is too much. He is making allegations that one Minister has become* ....*(Interruptions)* I am raising a point of order. No such allegation was made even by Guruswamy. *(Interruptions)* Sir, I am on a point of order. I am not objecting to him. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, the Ministries are allocated, on the advice of the Prime Minister by the President. It is a well known fact. Now, the hon.

Member in the House is making an allegation, saying that these Ministries are*

(Interruptions)

If you want to have a debate on the Government sector, let us have. *(Interruptions)*

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: अरे, मैं जो बता रहा हूं, सर, यह देखिए, मैं क्वोट कर रहा हूं...**(व्यवधान)** जरा मेरी कोटेशन तो सुन लें, यह इंडिया टुडे में निकला है, पहले उसको सुन तो लें, मैं क्वोट कर रहा हूं...**(व्यवधान)** सभापति महोदय, मैं क्वोट कर रहा हूं...**(व्यवधान)**

MISS. SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): Sir, he is not making any allegation. He is quoting from a magazine. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to know from the hon. Member whether he is only referring to the allegations made by Guruswamy. what has he said?

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: Yes, Sir. I am quoting from *India Today*. I quote: "* .." *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, that is an article in *India Today*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me find out.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: यह चर्चा का विषय है यहां ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री टी० एन० चतुर्वेदी (उत्तर प्रदेश): जो शब्द उन्होंने इस्तेमाल किये थे...**(व्यवधान)** देखिए, उन्होंने जो शब्द इस्तेमाल किए थे, वे दूसरी तरह के थे...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री सभापति: मेरी बात सुनिए। ये शब्द गुरुस्वामी के है या किसी और के है?

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, मेरी पूरी बात सुन ले। मैंने कहा कि देश में आज एक मज़ाक बन रहा है और वह मज़ाक क्या है, यह मैंने निवेदन किया और ये मज़ाक बन रहा है। मैंने उद्धृत भी कर दिया। समाचारपत्रों में और मैगजींस में ये मज़ाक बन रहा है। इनके दल के लोग सेंट्रल हॉल में कह रहे हैं...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री टी० एन० चतुर्वेदी : ये पुराने पौलिटिकल ऐडवाइज़र रहे हुए हैं...**(व्यवधान)** ये प्रधानमंत्री के पोलिटिकल ऐडवाइज़र रहे हुए हैं। इन्हें कुछ पुरानी चीजें याद आ रही हैं...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, जो मैं शुरू में कह रहा था...**(व्यवधान)**

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I am also referring to some article. *(Interruptions)* What have you to say about this?. The AICC says...*(Interruptions)* This is what you are doing. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would urge the hon. Members not to quote others comments. Please make your own comments. Don't refer to *India Today* when it has not specifically been mentioned in Guruswamy's statement. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: I am not making any allegation. I just mentioned that is what is being said outside this House. This is what I said. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: It has been reported on one of the magazines. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. *(Interruptions)*. I would request the hon. Member to keep the level of the debate...*(Interruptions)*. Please don't refer to what is being said in the Central Hall, or, anywhere else. Let us make the debate more serious. The subject is much more serious than gossip. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Sir, you will remember that earlier Mr. Naidu also quoted from some magazine *(Interruptions)*. Sir, you will remember that a senior Member from BJP was quoting from a magazine. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Poojary, let me tell you this. At that time the issue was different from this one. So, don't mix..*(Interruptions)*. Don't mix that issue with this. *(Interruptions)*. It would be

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

better...*(Interruptions)*. He is a very responsible Member. I know he is a very senior Member. So, rather than quoting from gossip in the Central Hall, or, from newspapers, I think he has enough material.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, यह देखिए यह उसका इंटरव्यू है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear. *(Interruptions)*. What is it? *(Interruptions)*. Yes, what is the interview? *(Interruptions)*. Please, sit down. *(Interruptions)*. Mr. Hanumanthappa, I think Shri Jitendra Prasad is quite sufficient to defend himself you need not intervene. *(Interruptions)*. No, no. *(Interruptions)*. Shri Jitendra Prasada is quite sufficient to defend himself. *(Interruptions)*. No, no. *(Interruptions)*. At present, in this debate we are only concerned about the article on Shri Mohan Guruswamy, and not a commentary on that article. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JITENDRA PARASADA: I am quoting.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: It should be deleted from the record. *(Interruptions)*. If he takes the responsibility, ..*(Interruptions)*. Yes, he can. *(Interruptions)*. If he does not take the responsibility, then he cannot. *(Interruptions)*. That is a different thing. *(Interruptions)*. You cannot convert Parliament ...*(Interruptions)*.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: मैं तो कोट कर रहा हूं ...**(व्यवधान)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him quote. *(Interruptions)*.

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत (राजस्थान): यह कहना गलत है।

श्री सभापति: आप बैठिए, आप बैठिए। जितेन्द्र प्रसाद जी, बोलिए।

SHRI JITENDRA PARASADA: I am quoting. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. No point of order. *(Interruptions)*.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, यह एशियन ऐज है। इसमें गुरुस्वामी क्या कहते हैं फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के लिए:

'He should also tell the MPs exactly how many times the Prime Minister personally spoke to him about the matter and how the PMO was actively liaisoning for the Hindujas.'

आडवाणी के लिए इन्होंने क्या कहा, किसी के लिए उन्होंने क्या कहा, इन सब के लिए निकाल दो।...**(व्यवधान)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. *(Interruptions)*. This only shows him speaking of the Hindujas and the Prime Minister. But saying this, * *(Interruptions)* No, no. *(Interruptions)*.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: वह भी है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: But they are saying, this * *(Interruptions)*. Here, we should make this debate very serious as it is a very serious matter. so, only quote that much which is given. Don't quote what others say. *(Interruptions)*. they may be saying so many things. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, that should not go on record. *(Interruptions)*. It is simple. *(Interruptions)* It is not ordinary...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka) : We are not sitting here to be dictated to by the ruling party. *(Interruptions)* . We should not be told as to waht to speak, and what not to speak. *(Interruptions)* . Let them dictate the speech and give it here. We will read it. *(Interruptions)* . I say, you have to learn so many things. *(Interruptions)*. You cannot dictate to the House.. *(Interruptions)*.

---

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसादः सर, इसमें बहुत बड़े घोटाले हैं, घोटाला छिपाना चाहते हैं, पारदर्शिकता नहीं चाहते । अगर आप परदर्शिकता चाहते हैं तो Please listen to me and then answer.

(Interruptions).

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA : You cannot speak like this. We have a right to criticise you. *(Interruptions).* It is our right to criticise you. *(Interruptions)* You cannot stand up every second. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : All of a sudden he stands up and goes on giving sermons. We are not children sitting here. *(Interruptions).* He is always doing like this. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order..*(Interruptions)* .. I want to raise a point of order.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA : No, you can't dictate. *(Interruptions)* You can't dictate.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Without any proof if he says that he is referring to Guruswamy ...*(Interruptions).*. It is a very serious charge against the Minster and the Prime Minsiter...*(Interruptions).*

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKERJEE : He cannot speak like this..*(Interruptions)* .. He cannot speak like this. There is a limit. ...*(Interruptions)* ... He cannot rise like this...*(Interruptions)* ....

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: He was in the Government..*(Interruptions)* He is a very senior Member... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA : You should have patience to listen to others...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA : This is a strategy to stall the discussion. Sir, they don't want to face the facts. That is why they are interrupting..*(Interruptions)* ... They don't want to face the facts. They are quilty.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: We want to face the facts..*(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: They are guilty...*(Interruptions)*.. they are guilty, Sir...*(Interruptions)* ....

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE : You are not allowing us to speak.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : You tell us the facts. Don't make allegations. Give us the evidence.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA : Whatever I have said are facts.

...(व्यवधान)....सभापति महोदय,...(व्यवधान)....

श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी : पुजारी जी, मैं आपकी पूजा करता हूं। शब्दों में भी आपकी पूजा कर दूंगा। ...(व्यवधान)...शब्दों में आपकी अच्छी पूजा कर दूंगा। आप फ्रिक मत करिए।...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Let them dictate the speeches, we will read! ...(*Interruptions*)... We know the parliamentary debate.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: We don't have...(*Interruptions*)... Don't read. Go by the rules.... ...(*Interruptions*)... Go by the rules.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: We will not speak. Let them give speeches and dictate. ....(*Interruptions*)... You dictate. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KHAN GHUFRAN ZAHIDI (UTTAR PRADESH): You go on dictating.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I don't have the intention to dictate. Sir my point is very simple. My appeal to you is...(*Interruptions*)...I am not dictating to them. My appeal to you is...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Let him make allegations. ...(*Interruptions*)... They are denigrating the Minister and the Prime Minister. ...(*Interruptions*)... You are denigrating the Prime Minister. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Don't dictate to us. ...(*Interruptions*)....

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : यहां तो आप रोक लेंगे, बाहर नहीं रोक पाएंगे। बाहर निकलकर सुनो, बाहर लोग क्या कह रहे हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**....क्या-क्या कह रहे हैं? इससे ज्यादा और कुछ कह रहे हैं। मैंने कुछ नहीं कहा ...**(व्यवधान)**..(सेंट्रल हॉल में क्या कह रहे हैं लोग ?...**(व्यवधान)**...यहां तो आप इस तरह से रोक सकते हैं लेकिन...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, if we are allowed to speak, we will speak; otherwise, we will not speak. ...*(Interruptions)*. You give the speeches, we will read them. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Here, I have the book of "Unparliamentary Expressions". ...*(Interruptions)*... Please let me see, let me read. At page 97, it is mentioned, calling somebody "The Minister of something or other", is unparliamentary. It will not go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am not saying anything. I am not saying anything. We shall look into the record. ...*(Interruptions)*....

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : मैंने कोई गाली नहीं कही। मैंने जो बात कही थी....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not saying anything. I will look into the record and then do it.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : नहीं, नहीं। जो बात मैंने कही थी...

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will look into the record and then do it.

SHRI VYALAR RAVI (KERALA) : Sir, you have given a ruling. I am not questioning the ruling. Sir, you have rightly said that you will look into it. The hon. Member never said *. He never said that. He said there are Ministers ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : मैंने तो पहले कहा है। मैंने तो...**(व्यवधान)**...अरे आप के ही लोग कह रहे हैं। आप ही के लिए कह रहे हैं। सेंट्रल हाल में जाकर देखो, पूछो, क्या-क्या कह रहे है?...**(व्यवधान)**...आप कान बंद किए बैठे हो।

...**(व्यवधान)**...आपके लोग सेंट्रल हॉल में क्या-क्या कह रहे हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी : आप सेंट्रल हॉल की बातें यहां कर रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)** सेंट्रल हॉल की बातें यहां क्यों कर रहे हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)** इसके ऊपर अगर डिबेट आ जाए तो...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : आप ही के लोग कह रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**....

श्री टी०एन०चतुर्वेदी : सेंट्रल हॉल में जो बात हो रही है तो कौन किसका मज़ाक कर रहा है? ...**(व्यवधान)**

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Don't mention anything about the AICC in the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only Jitendra Prasadaji will speak, nobody else. ...*(interruptions)*... Only Jitendra Prasadaji will speak, nobody else. If anybody else speaks, it will not go on record.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद :सभापति महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री की छवि का बड़ा इनको ख्याल है, बड़े इनके नेता है। बहुत इनको ख्याल है, बड़ा इनको दर्द है।

मुझे बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि अगर आप को जरा भी प्रधान मंत्री जी की छवि का ख्याल होता तो कम से कम देखते कि यह क्या हो रहा है? उनकी छवि खराब करने के लिए, उनके ऊपर प्रश्न-चिह्न लगाने के लिए सारी एक्सरसाइज की जा रही है और हम आपकी मदद कर रहे हैं कि इसको साफ कर दीजिए। आप जनता के सामने साफ तस्वीर रखिए, लेकिन आप उसके लिए राजी नहीं हो रहे है। आप उस पर यहां सवाल कर रहे हैं, आप उसको रोकना चाहते हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी : मैं आपको याद दिला देता हूं कि आपके एक अफसर ने जो पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री के एडवाइजर थे, उन्होंने पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में क्या कहा उस प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में क्या कहा उस छवि को भी आप जरा साफ कर दीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में नहीं कहा था। ...**(व्यवधान)**....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Are you yielding to him? If you are not yielding, you speak. *(Interruptions)* ... Only Jitendra Prasada will speak.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : सर, कोठरी के बारे में कहा जाता था। प्रधान मंत्री का बहुत जिक्र आया, मुझे बहुत अच्छी तरह से याद है, यहां पर कुछ बैठे हुए नेतागण,

जब यह विपक्ष में थे तो यह फ्रेज कहा गया था:- "His son writes this".

आज जब हम मोहन गुरुस्वामी का पूरा आर्टिकल, पढ़ते हैं तो यहां पर-"His son-in-law writes this".

यह जो सन-इन-ला का दखल यहां पर देखा गया है, समय-समय पर आया है, मैं उसको उद्धृत नहीं करना चाहता हूं, न उसके बारे में ज्यादा कहना चाहता हूं, मगर इनके दल, को अगर प्रधान मंत्री की छवि का थोड़ा भी ख्याल है तो कम से कम उसका एक स्पष्टीकरण ये जरूर देंगे जिससे कि कम से कम जनता के सामने जो एक भ्रम फैला हुआ है वह साफ हो सके। अरूण शौरी जी कहते हैं कि डाकूमेंट्री एवीडेंस होना चाहिए। अरूण शौरी जी मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि वह सलाहकार आपकी सरकार में था, आपकी पार्टी का एक व्यक्ति जिस पर पूरा भरोसा था। वित्त मंत्री जी का सलाहकर एक बात कह रहा है और आप एवीडेंस हमसे मांग रहे हैं। अगर हमारे पास एवीडेंस होता तो या तो आप कोर्ट में होते या कुछ इसमें से जेल में होते, जिस तरह के आरोप लगाए गए हैं। ... **(व्यवधान)**...

श्री एम० वेंकैया नायडु : थैंक्यू थैक्यू। एवीडेंस नहीं है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : ये जो आरोप हैं, ये आरोप तो आपके ही सलाहकार ने आपके ऊपर लगाए हैं। आपको उसकी सफाई देनी है। हम तो सिर्फ जानकारी चाहते हैं कि आप क्या सफाई देते हैं? क्योंकि हम समझ रहे हैं कि अगर इस तरीके से आपकी सरकार चल रही है तो देश सुरक्षित नहीं है, देश खतरे में है, पता नहीं आप किस-किस से सौदा कर रहे हैं? मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा अरूण शौरी जी कि आप तो परदा उठाने का काम करते थे लेकिन आज आप परदा डालने का काम कर रहे हैं, आपने जो बातें कहीं है वह परदा डालने के काम की हैं। अगर परदा उठाना है तो एक जे०पी०सी० कायम की जाए, एक डिटेल में इस पर चर्चा हो जिससे कि जनता के सामने सच्चाई आ सके। अगर आपने कुछ नहीं किया है तो जनता के सामने हर चीज डिटेल में जाएगी। इस तरीके से बहस को स्टाल करना, बहस को रोकना, सच्चाई सामने न आने देना, इस सब से अंधकार फैला रहेगा।

सभापति महोदय, मैं कुछ सवाल, पूछना चाहता हूं। मैं इनसे यह जरूर पूछना चाहूंगा कि मोहन गुरुस्वामी की वित्त मंत्री के सलाहकार के रूप में नियुक्ति कब हुई थी? वित्त मंत्री जी जरूर इसका जवाब देंगे। इनकी नियुक्ति किसने की थी? क्या इनकी योग्यता थी? जो आपने देखी थी, उनकी अनुभव, क्षमता क्या थी? उनकी नियुक्ति किन-किन आधारों पर की गई थी? क्या इनका अपाईटमेंट आडवाणी जी के कहने से किया गया था? क्योंकि कहीं न कहीं इंटरव्यु में आया है कि इनकी नियुक्ति आडवाणी जी के इशारे पर की गई थी। इनकी ब्रीफ क्या थी? यह भी हम जानना चाहेंगे। क्या इन्होंने अपने ब्रीफ को एक्सीड किया? वह कौन-सा ब्रीफ था जिसको यह एक्सीड कर गए? क्या इन्होंने कहा था कि मैंने वही किया जो आडवाणी जी ने मुझसे कहा था। अगर यह कहा था तो यह भी हम जानना चाहेंगे कि ये आपके आदेशों पर थे या आडवाणी जी के आदेशों पर थे या प्रधान मंत्री जी के आदेशों पर थे? यहां पर ये एडवाइजर थे या कंसलटेंट थे? आपने शायद कहीं पर कहा है कि ये कंसलटेंट थे। मेरी जानकारी में ये एडवाइजर थे क्योंकि इनका इस्तीफा स्वीकार किया गया, यह मेरे पास इस्तीफे के आर्डर की फोटो काफी है:

> "Shri Mohan Guruswamy who has been appointed as Adviser to the Finance Minister vide this Department's order of even number dated 3rd August, 1998 was relieved of his duties on 3rd February, 1999."

तो यहां पर यह एडवाइजर ही थे। आपने शायद इनको कंसलटेंट कहा है। बहरहाल जो भी थे हम यह जानना चाहेंगे कि यह क्या थे?

महोदय, अब मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से सीधे कुछ प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूं। मेरा निवेदन है कि वित्त मंत्री जी सीधा और स्पष्ट उत्तर दें। संख्याओं की जगह संख्या दें, आंकड़ों, की जगए आंकड़ा और तिथियों की जगह तिथिवार विवरण दें। ये सारे प्रश्न सीधे श्री मोहन गुरुस्वामी के दो लेखों के बारे में है। एक लेख है-

"Why I was sacked" of 22nd February, 1999.

दूसरा लेख है-

Which Mr. Yashwant Sinha must answer is of 11th March, 99.

पहले मैं जी०ई०कैप्स के बारे में जानना चाहूंगा कि पिछले 12 महीनों में किस-किस सरकारी वित्तीय संस्थान ने जी०ई०कैप्स नाम की कंपनी को किस-किस मद में किस-किस तारीख को निवेश, ऋण, एडवांस किसी भी रूप में कितना रुपया दिया है?

दूसरा प्रश्न है ऋण दिया है तो ब्याज की किस दर से? निवेश किया है तो उस निवेश पर इन संस्थानों का

पिछले वित्तीय वर्ष में रिटर्न के रूप में कितना रुपया मिला है यानी रिटर्न आन इन्वेस्टमेंट मेड? जी०ई०कैप्स भारत में कब से कार्यरत है? किस व्यापार में कार्यरत है? जब से जी०ई० कैप्स भारत में कार्यरत हुई है, तब से आज तक उसने वर्ष में कितने विदेशी मुद्रा का निवेश किया है? कितना मुनाफा कमाया है और कितनी मुद्रा विभिन्न मदों में विदेश भेजी है? जी०ई० कैप्स की सैक्टरवाइज लेंडिंग कितनी रही है? क्या यह सही है कि जी०ई०कैप्स नाम की यह कंपनी सरकारी संस्थानों से सस्ते दर पर रुपया उठाकर उसे ऊंची दर पर बाजार में उठाने का बिचौलियों का काम करती थी? सरकारी वित्तीय संस्थानों ने जी०ई०कैप्स को यह रुपया किस आधार पर और किस गारन्टी के एगेन्स्ट दिया है? क्या जी०ई०कैप्स ने वित्तीय संस्थानों को अपनी अमरीकी पैरेन्ट कंपनी का कोई कमफर्ट लेटर" दिया है। यदि हां तो क्या वित्त मंत्री को उस कम्फर्ट लैटर" को सदन के पटल पर रखने में कोई संकोच है? संकोच नही है तो उस कम्फर्ट लेटर को रखें।

एनरॉन के बारे में भी मुझे पूछना है। एनरॉन नाम की अमरीकन कंपनी को "डाभोल टू" पावर प्लांट के लिए भारत में ऋण अथवा निवेश रेट करने की आरंभिक अथवा मूल सीमा कितने प्रतिशत थी? और विदेशी मुद्रा लेने की सीमा क्या थी? क्या सरकार ने एनरॉन को नियमित से अधिक भारतीय मुद्रा अर्थात् लोकल फंड्स उठाने की सीमा बढ़ाई है, यदि हां तो कब, किस सीमा तक? यह फेवर किन कारणों से और किस आधार पर की गई? क्या यह सही है कि महाराष्ट्र विद्युत बोर्ड से बिजली एक रुपया प्रति यूनिट की दर से ली जाती है जबकि एनरॉन को प्रति यूनिट तीन रुपये दिये जाते हैं?

स्टील के बारे में मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या 1997 अर्थात् गुजरात सरकार के कार्यकाल में कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री स्टील डंपिंग की शिकायतों को एग्जामिन करने के बाद इस निर्णय पर पहुंची थी कि भारतीय स्टील निर्माता डब्लू०टी०ओ० के मानकों की सीमा के अनुरूप एंटी डंपिंग मेजर्स का केस बनाने में असफल रही है? क्या माननीय वित्त मंत्री कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री की उस फाइल को चेयरमैन के कमरे में सभी दलों के नेताओं को दिखाने को तैयार हैं? अक्तूबर, 1998 के महीने में वित्त मंत्री ने कामर्स तथा स्टील मंत्री और सरकारी तथा निजी क्षेत्र के प्रतिनिधियों की कोई बैठक बुलाई थी जिसमें यह तय हुआ था कि इम्पोर्टेड स्टील पर कस्टम ड्यूटी की दर तय करने के लिए एक रिफरल प्राइस तय की जाए? क्या इस मीटिंग में इंपोर्टेड स्टील के लिए किसी तरह की फ्लोर प्राईस तय करने की बात हुई थी? क्या वित्त मंत्री भाजपा के पारदर्शिता के सिद्धांत और आदर्श के अनुरूप इस मीटिंग के मिनट्स सदन के पटल पर रखेंगे? क्या अक्टूबर कि इस मीटिंग के बाद संबद्ध मंत्रालयों के प्रतिनिधियों का एक वर्किंग ग्रुप गठित किया गया था? क्या इस ग्रुप ने इंपोर्टेड एच०आर० क्वायल्स के लिए कोई रिफरल प्राइस तय की थी, यदि हां तो कितनी और किस आधार पर? इस वर्किंग ग्रुप की रिपोर्ट किस-किस मंत्रालय या मंत्री को भेजी गई? उस पर क्या टिप्पणियां की गई? रिफरल प्राइस के बदले नोटिफिकेशन के "फ्लोर प्राइस" की घोषणा करने का निर्णय किसका था? क्या इस निर्णय से पहले यह बात किसी स्तर पर डिसकस हुई थी कि रिफरल प्राइस को हटा कर फ्लोर प्राइस नोटिफाई करने के क्या इम्पलिकेशन्स होंगे?

तीन सौ दो डालर की जो फ्लोर प्राइस नोटिफाई की गई वह इंटर मिनिस्ट्रीयल ग्रुप द्वारा सुझाई गई रिफरल प्राइस से कितने डालर ज्यादा था? क्या इस रिफरल प्राइस के बदले फ्लोर प्राइस नोटिफाई किए जाने के निर्णय में प्रधान मंत्री शामिल थे?

जून, 1998 से फरवरी 1999 के बीच लंदन मेटल एक्सचेंज में स्टील अर्थात एच०आर० क्वाइल की कीमतें क्या थी और इस अवधि में हमारे स्टील इंपोर्टर्स ने एक्चुवली किस भाव पर स्टील इंपोर्ट किया?

क्या 4, जनवरी 1998 को वित्त मंत्री ने स्टील इंडस्ट्री की समस्याओं पर विचार के लिए कोई औपचारिक या अनौपचारिक बैठक बुलाई थी? यदि हां, तो उस मीटिंग में निजी अथवा सरकारी क्षेत्र के कौन कौन प्रतिनिधि उपस्थित थे इस मिटिंग में किस किस स्टील कंपनी के बेल आउट के प्रस्तावों पर चर्चा हुई या सिर्फ एक की हुई? क्या वित्त मंत्री को इस मीटिंग के मिनट्स और इस मीटिंग के बाद उनके और उद्योगपति या उद्योगपतियों के बीच हुए विचार-विमर्श का ब्यौरा संसद को देने से राष्ट्रहित को क्षति पहुंचने का अंदेशा है? उसमें राज की बात, उद्योगपति को बेल आउट करने के लिए क्या हुई क्या इसकी हमको जानकारी दी जाएगी क्योंकि शक की सुई मोहन गुरुस्वामी ने उधर घुमाई है। फास्ट ट्रेक पावर, प्रोजक्ट जो हिन्दुजा का था, यह प्रोजक्ट कब से पेंडिंग पड़ा था? आपकी सरकार से पहले से पेंडिंग पड़ा था, या आपकी सरकार जब आई तब यह कितने दिन पेंडिंग पड़ा रहा और फिर एकदम सेंक्शन कैसे हुआ? क्या इसकी सेटिंग अप कास्ट, पहले के प्लांट और मशीनरी के, 40 परसेंट कम हो गयी! क्या वित्त मंत्रालय के विरोध के बावजूद पी०एम० के निर्देश पर कोल इंडिया जैसे घाटे में चल रहे संस्थान से इसकी गारंटी दिलाई? क्या इसको प्रोटेक्शन देने के लिए यह गारंटी दिलाई गई?

क्या मोहन गुरुस्वामी ने कहा कि अगर यह काम हमने किया और आपके वित्त सचिव ने भी कहा कि इसके लिए हम जेल भी जा सकते हैं। जब आपसे पूछा गया तो आपने भी कुछ ऐसा ही जवाब दिया। लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी हिन्दुजा **[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी) पीठासीन हुए]** का प्रोजक्ट सेंक्शन हुआ और उसको दायरे से बाहर जाकर प्रोटेक्शन प्रोवाइट किया गया ताकि हिन्दुजा को नुकसान न हो। कोल इंडिया जैसी घाटे में चल रहे पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग प्रधानमंत्री जी खुद कह चुके हैं कि हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि हमें इन अंडरटेकिंग्स का क्या करना होगा जो घाटे में चल रहा है, तो उस घाटे में चल रही अंडरटेकिंग से हिन्दुजा को गारंटी दिलाई गई, प्रोटेक्शन दिलाया गया कि अगर कोयला न पहुंचा तो यह कोल इंडिया की जिम्मेदारी होगी।

ब्रिटिश टुबैको कंपनी, इसके बारे में मोहन गुरुस्वामी कहते हैं कि इसकी डिटेल में मैं नहीं जाऊंगा लेकिन हमको खामोश करने की कोशिश की गई। There was a pressure to silence him. क्या यह सही है? आपकी जानकारी में यह बात है? मैंने तो सुना है कि आज की कोई इंटरव्यू शायद जी०टी०वी० पर आया है। जिसमें गुरुस्वामी ने नेम किया कि कोई दीपक तलवार है, जिसके माध्यम से उसके पास संदेश भेजा गया। I have been told that Mr. Guruswamy had said this in an intervie to the Zee TV. If you don't want to discuss, don't discuss anything. All these things are in newspapers. People are raising questions. If you don't want to say anything, don't say anything.
एशियन एज में है: "I received an offer for my silence."

मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इसका ब्यौरा क्या है।...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी): बोलने दीजिए, बोलने दीजिए।

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: गुरुस्वामी तो आपके हैं। वह आपके बड़े विश्वासपात्र और बड़े विद्वान थे। ...**(व्यवधान)**... गुरुस्वामी ने जो पूछा है मैं उसे दुबारा पूछ रहा हूं गुरुस्वामी ने अपने लेख में लिखा है कि: A coterie headed by Shri Vajpayee's adopted son-in-law is meddling in Government's crucial decisions.
इसके बारे में क्या आप जानकारी देंगे?

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि it is a party with a difference. It is a Government with a difference. This party has become a party of differences.
मतभेद, एक दूसरे से मतभेद, आपस में मतभेद, प्रधानमंत्री के व्यक्तित्व पर प्रश्नचिन्ह लग गया है। पूरी सरकार के ऊपर प्रश्नचिन्ह लग गया है और आप जिस पारदर्शिता की सदैव दुहाई देते थे, उसका खोखलापन सामने आ गया है। यदि आप चाहते हैं कि आपकी साख बनी रहे और अगर, जो आप कहते हैं उस पर अमल करते हैं तो हम लोगों की तरफ से जो जे०पी०सी० की मांग है, उसको आप मंजूर करिए। सारे तथ्य सामने रखिये क्योंकि जितने सवाल मैंने आपसे किये हैं, अगर आप तथ्य नहीं देते हैं तो उसका कोई हल निकलने वाला नहीं है। यह तथ्य तभी निकल सकते हैं जब बाकायदा फाइलें ले कर के जे०पी०सी० बैठे, डिटेल में मिनट्स स्टडी किये जाएं, एक एक निर्णय स्टडी किया जाए तभी हम किसी निष्कर्ष पर पहुंच सकते हैं कि कितना घोटाला हुआ है और मोहन गुरुस्वामी ने जिस घोटाले की तरफ इंगित किया है, उसमें सरकार द्वारा कितना भ्रष्टाचार हुआ है, कितनी गड़बड़ी हुई है। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE MINISTER OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RAM JETHMALANI): Mr. Chairperson, Sir, it is a pity that my venerable friend, Dr. Manmohan Singh, who moved initially in this matter, is not present to hear what I have to say. But, Sir, even though he is absent, I would like to pay my tribute to him...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Please use the microphone. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Normally, Sir, I don't need a mocrophone.

Sir, the tribute that I wish to pay to Dr. Manmohan Singh is, if he got up and made an accusation of corruption against me and he said that he was making it out of his personal knowledge, I would not venture to contradict him; I would immediately plead guilty to the charge. But, Sir, in this tribute which I have paid to him, there is one important condition. The condition is that the hon. doctor should be able to get up and say that he,

of his personal knowledge, was making that allegation. In this case, obviously Dr. Manmohan Singh has no personal knowledge of any kind. Some allegations have been made outside the House in a newspaper—twice in on newspaper and the third time in another—and Dr. Manmohan Singh hasn't even had the benefit of calling Mr. Guruswamy, who had made those allegations and at least in his own way, however inefficacious it might be, interrogating and cross-examining Mr. Guruswamy. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOTRA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, that is an assumption. (*Interruptions*) That is an assumption that Mr... (*Interruptions*) Mr. Singhal, I am addressing him. You have the habit of shouting.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Malhotra, please keep quiet. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Jayant Malhotra, please let him continue. There are a large number of speakers and this is a serious issue, as the hon. Chairman mentioned.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Hon. Mr. Jayant Kumar Malhotra says that I am making an assumption. I make assumptions everyday in life, but those assumptions must be reasonably based on circumstantial evidence. After Dr. Manmohan Singh spoke, my friend, Arun Shourie, spoke from this side. Arun Shourie made the same point. He made it with great emphasis, and he said that, after all, what is all this that is being talked about? Somebody says something in a newspaper, the hon. Member picks it up, does not buttress it or support it by anything within his own knowledge and relies totally on hearsay, unaffirmed, unsworn, uncontradicted, un-cross-examined.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR Nominated: Sir, I must protest it. The hon. Minister is referring to newspaper reports as if they are gossips.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): He is referring to... ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: Please treat newspapers with respect because the way we treat the Press is not correct.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Kuldip Nayyar, he is not criticising the Press. All he is saying is, the supporting evidence which should be there has not been adduced. That is all he has referred to. You will have your chance. Please sit down. Let him continue.

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Sir,... ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Please sit down. Let him continue.

Mr. Jethmalani, you can ignore him. ...(*Interruptions*)... You cannot help him. Nobody can help him.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, interruptions are not likely to ruffle me. All that I was telling Mr. Jayant Malhotra was that my assumption is based upon reasonable circumstantial evidence that after Mr. Arun Shourie pointed out that Dr. Manmohan Singh was speaking without the slightest personal—basis foundation, it would have been open to Dr. Manmohan Singh to counteract this by getting up and saying that, no, at least, he has had the opportunity of either talking to the gentleman or interrogating him, and trying to verify the veracity of what he said. ...(*Interruption*)...

श्री खान गुफ़रान ज़ाहिदी: सुनिए तो। अगर अखबार में कोई चीज छपती है, इंटरव्यू छपता है तो उसके लिए और बढ़कर...(व्यवधान) क्या चीज लायी जा सकती है...(व्यवधान) आपके अधिकारी हैं। अभी अगर मिनिस्टर यह सोचें कि वे भी कहते है...व्यवधान) मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं अजम्पशन है...(व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी): आपने बात कह दी...(व्यवधान)

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, on a matter of this kind, it is better not to surrender to heat or emotion, it is better to listen to an argument, and then refute it on an itellecctual and logical plane. I believe that if there was any more material in the possession of Dr. Manmohan Singh, his speech would have declared it, would have disclosed it. Since he has not chosen to do so, I am entitled to assume that there is nothing more than bare fact of reading these three articles. Now, let us read the two articles written by Mr. Guruswamy. What do these articles say? These two articles and the third interview must ultimately be read in conjunction with a fourth statement which was published only yeterday— he made it the day before yesterday, but published only yesterday — in which the gentleman repeated, "I have not made any charges of corruption against anyone." Now, let us look at...

SHRI KHAN GHUFRAN ZAHIDI: Who has said it?...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Now, let us look at the *Asian Age* article, the first one out of the two. First of all, hon. Members should take note of an assertaion in that article which reads like this. He talks of various things which happened. He said that the Government was not trying to face pressures, but was trying to duck them—charge number one. Sir, I don't know whether this is a charge at all. I don't see why when a person is assaulted, he should not try to duck. Ducking is not an imperative respones to an attack made upon the Government. You try to duck, but if you can't duck, you fight back. Fighting back produces violence, produces friction of a kind which is avoidable.

I do not see why the Government should face a charge which is as vague and absurd as this that the Government is not facing the music but is ducking the music. But, Sir, it is well said and every lawyer who has gone to a law school as the hon. Member with a wide experience knows that unless when you make an abstract statement and support it by concrete details, the abstract statement is only an inference to somebody from circumstances which may or may not exist. It is the duty of the person who makes this kind of a vague statement to concretise it, to give details, so that the house should be able to judge whether the inference which is finally sought to be drawn legitimately supported by the fact which the hon. Member has considered. I have a very distinguished ex-Chief Justice sitting here in front of me and I hope the hon. ex-Chief Justice will be able to advise all his compatriots that even in this House, though we may not be bound by technical rules of evidence, but there are certain rules of evidence which are rules of commonsense, they are rules of justice, they are rules of fairplay and those rules must be observed and one of the rules is that you must be able to substantiate the vague allegations by concrete facts. It is not enough to tell me that I am corrupt....*(Interruptions)*...I will soon deal, with my adviser. But sometimes in this sordid world in which we live, one's advisers do sometimes switech over loyal ties and then speak for the other side. In fact, he is your undisclosed prosecution witness number one. But the prosecution witness number one whose evidence I am going to read out means nothing at all. He said the first thing is that the Government is ducking. The second thing he points out in his article and the whole of that article is confined to this is that there are five types of conflicts which are going on in the Government. The first, he said is the conflict between the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. The second he says that there is a conflict between the PMO and the Finace Minister. The third conflict is of an unofficial parts of the PMO and Mr. Guruswamy himself. The fourth is that there is Swadeshi Jagaran Manch conflict with the economic policies of the Government. But, having pointed out all these facts, Sir, I must inform the House, which is my duty, that even Mr. Guruswamy is a friend of mine. I have

known him for ages. I know him as a person who understands the job which he does. I have the honour of being the professor or teacher of his daughter who is a very clever girl like her own father. But, Sir, having mentioned this kind of conflicts that exist, what he says is the cause of his dismissal and the heading of this article, is, "Why I was sacked—the truth; they are hiding". Now, let us see where he summarises the cause of his sack. The cause of his sack is to be found on the second page of his article, in this very crucial sentence, which the hon. Members should careful grasp. He says, " I opposed suhartoism which is what I call a relative oriented crony capitalism that was sought to be passed off by the PMO and the PMH as liberalisation. In the end it was this dig me—in where Yashwant Sinha had nothing to do with my problem. He became a problem only after I was sacked." So, at least there is nothing which he did as an adviser to the Finance Minister. Nothing that the Finance did to him which was the cause of his sack. According to him, the cause of his sack is his complaint of *Suhartoism* which proved his undoing and brought about his sack. Sir, for the benefit of the hon. Members, who probably may be somewhat misled by this expression *'Suhartoism'*.

1.00 P.M.

Let me make it clear that the whole of the Indonesian economy is supposed to have collapsed because the entire distribution system in that country was handed over to the chosen relatives of the Head of the State because vast amounts were taken out from the banking system and given to those who were engaged in trade, business and industry in Indonesia and this has come to be called as *'Suhartoism'* Sir *'Suhartoism'*, therefore, means, misuse of public funds and property and assets for the benefit of one's relatives by putting those assets incharge of those persons either ostensibly for business or for other purposes. One thing is, therefore, certain that Mr. Guruswamy now says, in the final analysis, "I have been sacked because I complained of *'Suhartoism'* That raises two serious questions. That raises two very, very serious questions...*(Interruptions)*...

Do you mind to have a little patience?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Ravi, you have your chance to speak.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, that raises two questions: Where and when did Mr. Guruswamy make that complaint against *'Suhartoism'*; What form did that complaint take? Did that complaint exist anywhere? Has that ccomplaint come to the knowledge of anyone? And, the seccond one was this. Was there any substance in the allegation that was made? Was there any impact of *'Suhartoism'* was the Indian tax puyess money taken out from the coffers of Indian State and put in charge of the rulers, relatives or friends which is an essence of *'Suhartoism'*; I would have expected those who wish to support the stand, which has been taken on the other side, that they should have got up and asked for paticlulars; either walk up to Mr. Guruswamy or make your own independent investigations, and come to some conclusion that somebody in the Government, who is in a position to make his will effective in matters of the economic disposal of our assets, has come to an honest conclusion and should be able to be supported by his own personal knowledge of, at least, an investigation made that some *'Suhartoism'* was practised by the Prime Minister's Office or by the Government. I would have expected that in this article, there would have been some concrete case and there is one concrete case mentioned and that case does not seem to be a case of *'Suhartoism'* but it is a case of something else into which I will go and I will have no difficulty in showing to the august House and to every hon. Member, who has pledged, to arrive at conclusions on evidence and not on mere hearsay

flourished in newspapers outside. I do not know why my friend, Mr. Kuldip Nayyar, got up and protested that I am saying something against press. The press publishes. I am not saying that Mr. Guruswamy did not make these statements to the press. I did not say that the press had published a false account of Mr. Guruswamy's assertion. But, all that I am saying is, one's oral lie does not become truth merely because it is repeated to a newspaper and merely because you find the newspaper which is prepared irresponsibly to publish that oral assertion. That is all that I am saying.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: (WEST BENGAL): May I have a half-a-minute?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Certainly.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: You know the problem does not lie with us but it lies with you. You sowed it and you have to reap the consequences. You know this is as simple as that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): That is the reason why he is responding.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: These allegations may or may not be true. We are merely saying that these allegations deserved to be examined by a Joint Parliamentary Committee because you are forgetting one thing. The Prime Minister is not just your Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is my Prime Minister, the Prime Minister is the country's Prime Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): You have made your point.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: Any stigma which anybody tries to stick on him, is a stigma which we owe the responsibility to remove.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Now, let him complete.

I understand, the hon'ble Members have all agreed to dispense with the lunch hour. That was the understanding. There will be no lunch hour. Those Members who want to take their lunch can go and come back, after taking their lunch. Mr. Ram Jethmalani, you please continue.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Let me respond to Dr. Mitra's very useful interruptions. I am glad he accepts the 'obvious' that the Prime Minister is the country's Prime Minister and, therefore, Dr. Mitra's Prime Minister as well. But, Sir, my response to him is, the creation of a Joint Parliamentary Committee, its prolonged sittings, its prolonged hearings—and we have great experience in this country of Joint Parliamentary Committee' sitting—is a very costly affair. Is it the suggestion that without any hon'ble Member of this House taking the responsibility for what is stated outside, what a lawyer would call, 'heresay', an hearsay which ultimately when analysed, reduces itself to nothing and that is precisely what I am going to deal with, you should set up a JPC? We do not go about constituting Joint Parliamentary Committee for the purpose of examing every word of hearsay that is said outside. ...(*Interruptions*) ... It is well known Sir, let us not forget that it is almost notorious that the kind of politics to which we are reduced in this country, allegations and counter-allegations are flying around indiscriminately, almost everyday, almost every hour, and if we were to constitute Joint Parliamentary Committee, Sir, this House will be only sitting in Committee and doing no work. ...(*Interruptions*) ... I believe, this is a principle which this House must accept that unless allegations made do make out a case of great want of integrity in the Government, and unless that allegation is sustained by *prima-facie* good evidence, which appears as good evidence to the conscience and the intellegence of this august House, no Joint Parliamentary Committee, should be appointed and there should be no wastage of public time merely to go on investigating those red

herrings which are being cast from day to day in our political life. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, मैं जेठमलानी साहब से पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या आप कोई ऐसा इन्सटान्स देंगे, जिसमें कि गवर्नमेंट के एडवाइजर ने गवर्नमेंट को अटेक किया हो? पहले से आप एक्युजेशन की बात कर रहे हैं, गवर्नमेंट के एडवाइजर ने गवर्नमेंट को अटेक किया और उसके बाद आप सबस्टेन्सिएट की बात कर रहे हैं। यह तो आपको ही सफाई देनी है।

श्री राम जेठमलानी: ठीक है, मैं समझ गया।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी): आप अपनी बात कंटीन्यू करें। अब यह जरूरी नहीं कि आप हर इंटरप्शन का जवाब दें। आप अपनी बात कहिए और फिर उसका भी ध्यान रखिए। प्लीज, कन्टीन्यू करें।

SHRI RAM JATHMALANI: Sir, I proceed upon the assumption that every Member of this House is ultimately vulnerable to logic and reason. Therefore, Sir, since this point has been raised, let me give an answer, a technical answer. This is a problem which we face in our courts everyday. In fact, the great judge, who framed our law of evidence, which was based upon principles of commonsense, said that the admissions of an agent are binding upon the principal and the burden shifts—if somebody wants to show that those admissions are incorrect or false—to the principal. Now, you are unconsciously or consciously relying upon that principle that here is your employees, your advisor, he has made some allegation and, therefore, the burden is on you to show that they are false.

What is forgotten is this. I am here. Mr. N.K.P. Salve is here. Other lawyers are also sitting here. I am again surprised that even the ex-Chief Justice has left. There is a further modification of this principle that the admissions must be made during the continuance of the agency. If Guruswamy had made those allegations somewhere on the file in writing while he was the Financial Adviser, those admissions would have been the admissions of the principal, and he would have to come and prove that, those allegations were false or mistaken. But, an ex-agent, an ex-Financial Adviser or an ex-Adviser, is no longer in that position. Those assertions do not become my assertions. Otherwise, every dismissed domestic servant can go and make allegations against you, and you will have to appoint a Joint Parliamentary Committee to investigate into them. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): No, Mr. Vayalar Ravi. Let him continue.

Mr. Ravi's interruptions will not go on record. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

Mr. Vayalar Ravi, you will have your chance. Why are you exhausting yourself? You will have a chance. ...(*Interruptions*) ...Don't go back to the past. Don't exhaust yourself. We are confining ourselves to Mr. Guruswamy. ...(*Interruptions*)...

The Chairman has already ordered that we have to confine ourselves to Mr. Guruswamy. He does not want us to go into the past or the episode to which you have referred. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: He made enquiries and investigations into the Bofors scandal and then made the charges. Take the responsibility. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Ravi, please take your seat. Mr. Jethmalani is speaking. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

Both of you can have lunch together. Let him continue his speech.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: The performance of the hon. Member reminds me of a small ancedote in my professional life. Once I was defending a case. The Public Prosecutor spoke exactly in the manner they all did now. I was appearing before a jury in the city of Bombay. I told the gentlemen of the jury, "The learned Public Prosecutor of Bombay has tried to prove by his gesture

what the law requires him to prove by evidence." ...(*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Vayalar Ravi, don't try to exhaust yourself. Preserve your energy. You will have to speak. Why don't you preserve your energy. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

Mr. Jethmalani, you look towards the Chair. Address the Chair.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I only what to tell the hon. Member that if he cools down a little and if he speaks a little slowly, I will grasp what he is saying. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

Sir, if my hon. friend wants me to answer why I asked those ten questions, I am prepared to answer them immediately, but that will require, two days.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Minister, I am afraid, you have to confine yourself to the subject.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: My friend should not provoke me to irrelevance. I don't want to go into those long forgotten things. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Please co-operate with the Chair. Let him finish. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): Not only advisers but lawyers also change their sides. Sponsors also change their sides. This time the sponsor, Hinduja, changed sides. Naturally, you don't ask questions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Salim, again, he will have to address you.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Mr. Salim is such an enchanting provocateur that I don't wish to respond to him.

I do not wish to respond. Sir, the whole of this article makes one allegation against my Prime Minister. That allegation is that the Prime Minister makes declarations without trying to understand the economic implications of those declarations.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: That is not the only allegation.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Obviously he felt the need, as a writer to justify those allegations. Therefore, he had to give an illustration. I am sure he must have selected the best illustration, because everybody tries to put his best foot forward. The imaginative Mr. Guruswamy in the illustration that he has been able to furnish says that the Prime Minister announced the construction of a road from the North to the South and from the East to the West without understanding its implications. He says, the Prime Minister said that this would cost Rs. 28,000 crores, whereas Mr. Guruswamy said: "I think it will cost at least about four times that amount."

Sir, I am a little surprised that the hon. Member, Dr. Manmohan Singh, should have started his speech yesterday saying: "Madam, I say with sorrow that the former advisor or consultant or whatever one chooses to call him to the Finance Minister, has opened a can of worms." Unwrittingly there is a Pun there. Who are the worms: I do not know. "He has opened a can of worms. This raises serious questions about the Government's integrity." As the weekly magazine, *INDIA TODAY*, has put it, "he has hit the Government on one attribute it treasures most. That is, its integrity." I want hon. Members to understand the implications of this. If you rely upon it, and if somebody read the *INDIA TODAY*, this morning—I think, it was Mr. Jitendra Prasada, who read it—what does it mean? It means that this Government has an excellent reputation for integrity, until Mr. Guruswamy tried to damage it. And against my Prime Minister and the venerable gentlemen who occupy the Cabinet posts—I am not referring to myself, I am referring to my colleagues—there is Mr. Guruswamy, who can make a dention one year's

record of integrity and on decades of integrity for which my Prime Minister is known and against whose integrity, not even his enemies have been able to say this. And Mr. Guruswamy merely talked of an error of judgment. All that he said is that he has announced a scheme, which, according to him will cost Rs. 28,000 crores and according to Mr. Guruswamy it would cost much more. It may not cost much more. Who is right and who is wrong? Why should not the Prime Minister's estimate be right? Mr. Guruswamy does not have the courage to go up to the Prime Minister and interrogate him as to how did he arrive at the figure of Rs. 28,000 crores. The Prime Minister may have much better experts on the issue, who advised him that the roads can be constructed at that cost. How does he know that the Prime Minister had not carefully made an analysis and an evaluation of this project before he announced this to the public? Sir, is this a matter on which you appoint a Joint Parliamentary Committee and on which the venerable Dr. Manmohan Singh starts with saying that this is an attack on integrity? I say that the article contains no attack on integrity. The article only is an affirmation of integrity. It is the confession of integrity. There is a slight insinuation that Mr. Guruswamy is trying to make; he is trying to make a dent' an attempt which has misrably failed. It failed as much as he has failed to retain his office to which he was appointed.

And who appointed him? I do not want to answer it myself. I will ask Mr. Guruswamy to answer it. Mr. Guruswamy answers this himself. He said it was Mr. Yashwant Sinha, who appointed him against odds. And repeatedly the gentleman says, I am making no allegations of corruption.

If your only prosecution witness, who is in absentia making statements outside and says, "I am making no charge of corruption,"; and for Dr. Manmohan Singh to get up and see in those charges something called "the can of worms" it only means that the expression of "the can of worms" was used in the other sense that it has provoked a lot of works who are now taking advantage of that article and trying to poke fun at the Government which they are in any event entitled to do. This is a free democracy. In a democracy a cat can look at the king and make her own comments. Mr. Guruswamy has a right to do so. We don't challenge that right. But that this House should solemnly waste so much time by asking for a Joint Parliamentary Committee on the basis of this kind of flimsy material is a little too much. I would urge this august House not to be carried away by mere political considerations of this kind, not by ex-parte considerations of this kind because ultimately you are dealing with a Prime Minister. As Dr. Mitra says, "He is the Prime Minister of the whole country." I am glad that Dr. Mitra doesn't find it necessary to be here any longer. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: Mr. Guruswamy was your baby. ...(*Interruptions*)... Why should you shy away from the final consequence?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी॰एन॰ चतुर्वेदी): नहीं, वह वापिस आएंगे। ....(व्यवधान) वह आते-जाते रहते हैं। फिर वापिस आ जाएंगे। ....(व्यवधान)

Please continue. How long will you take?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: The writer of this article, Mr. Guruswamy,after having said that he is going to explain to the people as to why he was saked, as I told you, he talked of the differences, which according to him, are weakening the Government and the governance process. He has mentioned five of them. Then, he realised that none of these differences in the Government has anything to do with his sacking and so he uttered one more and almost it seemed to be a Freudian phenomena that somehow truth has a very inconvenient, uncanny habit of coming out, however

much you try to suppress it, because he himself recorded, "strictly speaking all these are irrelevant to the theme of my article." He says so, in so many words: "*Strictly the Advani-Atalji so-called* conflict is irrelevant to my theme." That is an irrelevance which has nothing to do with integrity. Sir, I wish to ask: Why would there not be differences? Why should there not be differences between the Home Minister and the Prime Minister? Why should there not be differences between any Minister and his colleagues? Why should there not be differences between any Minister and the Prime Minister? The question is, in the Cabinet form of Government so long as there is democracy, so long as there is freedom of thought and so long as Ministers are not robots and Ministers are not bonded slaves, Ministers will express their opinions. Ultimately, it is the Cabinet which overrules. It is the Prime Minister who has the confidence of the whole nation and the House who rules. Those who wish to disagree with the Prime Minister and are not willing to surrender their judgement have the liberty to walk out of the Cabinet, if they want to. That is the only way the Cabinet and the Government wants to function and will function. The Cabinet can't consist of worms, who will never turn once in their life just because they want to retain their jobs. So, Sir, if there are any differences, those differences are a welcome reflection of the democratic spirit and they are a welcome reflection of the fact that we have Ministers who do speak of their mind even to the Prime Minister. Ultimately, the Prime Minister chooses to overrule them. If they want to, they will walk out. But nobody has the monopoly of wisdom. If I feel that I am right and the Prime Minister is wrong, I will say to myself, is the Prime Minister so wrong that I cannot subordinate my judgement to him? I might even without being convinced, sometimes surrender my judgement to the Prime Minister. I have surrendered it to my valuable friends. My judgement tells me to go in a particular direction. My friends like Mr. Salim and Mr. Gupta and other tell me, "This is not the way." In spite of the fact that I feel I am right and they are wrong, but I say, I will follow them because after all they are my friends and they are giving me good advice. So, first of all, all this is absurd, irrelevant, non-sense that is being talked about in this article that there are differences between the Home Minister and the Prime Minister. I hope these differences, if there are, will be ironed out. But the fact of differences must continue if there is to be a lively Cabinet form of Government and the Cabinet form of Government does not... degenerate into some kind of slavery in which the intellect and the functions of Ministers are totally mortgaged to the chairs which they hold.

Sir, now, let us analyse the second article which he has written. All that he says in the second article, the most relevant sentence in that article, is—I wish to repeat it; perhaps, I will repeat it ten times—"I have not levelled any charges of corruption". If he has not levelled any charges of corruption, and it is an admitted position that Dr. Manmohan Singh has no more material than Mr. Guruswamy, then, surely, this 'can of worms' must be withdrawn and I would put it back in your pocket, Dr. Manmohan Singh. They might have a greater breeding space in that pocket of yours! Sir, it does not look very good that this can of worms should occupy the time of this House and the time of a Joint Parliamentary Committee.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): He wanted to open that can of worms.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Dr. Manmohan singh is an economist. He is not a botanist.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I will assume now against myself. I am now assuming myself that this gentleman, Financial Adviser, when he made these allegations, was acting as my agent and

therefore, in some sense. ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Sir, he is putting his leg on the chair.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA (Bihar): Sir, he is not supposed to keep his leg on the chair.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, you do not have to complain to him.

You can wink at me and I would not do that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: You were looking elsewhere.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have always looked more at you than at anybody else.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): You can rest assured that he will be always careful.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Even in the court, we have not behaved like this. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): He has taken note of your point. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: He says, "It is his perennial habit". I perennially plead guilty to that Judge.

Now, Sir, let us look at two or three cases which have been mentioned as illustrations of the fact that something is wrong. There is a mention made about the prices of steel. Sir, I wish this august House knew what exactly happened about the steel prices. There is no doubt that the steel industry is going through some kind of a crisis. I would not say that it is in a state of euphoria today. It is terribly bad. In September, 1998, a delegation of steel producers met the Finance Minister for the revival of the industry. The Finance Ministry constituted a Committee under the chairmanship of the Special Secretary, Mr. Vasudev. Amongst the many recommendations made by the Committee, one was the suggestion to fix floor prices on import of certain categories of steel items. Accordingly, the Department of Steel recommended to the Commerce Ministry requesting fixing of floor prices of seven steel items including coils. The basis of fixing the floor prices was the average export price from Europe and Japan from may to July, 1998 as reported in London Metal Bulletin. The price of these countries represents fair international export prices as against cheap import from CIS and South-Asian countries. Sir, the fact remains that the prices of steel have not risen, have not gone up. What is all this that is being talked about? What was the motivation for doing any such thing?

Sir, I do not have the time and energy to go through each one of these allegations. I believe that a man, when he makes his allegations, pushes them in an order. He takes the strongest first. It is his strongest allegation. The strongest allegation is a rope of sand here. It yields nothing at all. And if it yields nothing at all, I will leave it to my hon. Finance Minister to deal with the remaining allegations. But to me both as a lawyer and as a man of common sense, as a man who has some training for the last fifty years in appreciating evidence and in understanding that ultimately without evidence, no responsible person should go about.....casting these kinds of aspersions, which sometimes, in public life, have the habit of somehow sticking on. I have a sense of responsibility and a sense of ultimately the camaraderie because we are all running the democratic apparatus together. That itself should induce a sense of restraint and responsibility and not make use waste our time on flimsy allegations of this kind that the Prime Minister talked of a road the cost of which he did not know. I am sure, he knew the cost. But even if he did not know, he is the Prime Minister and once he makes a promise that Rs. 28,000 crores will be the money by which the road will be constructed, we should trust him. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Shri Sanatan Bisi.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, I would like to put the things factually correct. None of the articles referred to the steel price as the first one. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will be dealing mostly with the question of onus of proof and burden of proof. I would like to refer to the transaction that has taken place. Just now, may learned colleague, Shri Ram Jethmalani, has argued the case. The only thing which I would like to say here is that it is the duty of the Government to submit all those things here when they are speaking about integrity, transparency and other things. They should submit all those things before the House. So far as the question of this transaction is concerned, by making a sweeping remark or by stating without any evidence that no transaction has taken place, and whatever is being said here, should not be taken into consideration, is something which is not new. But here the situation is different. Here is a special circumstance. The special circumstance is that a statement was made by the appointee, his own man. This was a relevant statement. This statement was of a public nature. Why do I say that the statement was of public nature? This is because of the fact that the Opposition cannot have any document. The documents are in the possession of the Government. If the Government is ready and willing to submit these documents for the purpose of transparency, it is good. It is their duty also. But they did not do so. Why didn't the Government come to the House with a statement that whatever their appointee was stating, was not correct? They could have done so. It came out in the newspapers. When the Opposition as a whole stalled the proceedings of the House, a Short Duration Discussion was agreed to and the same is now taking place. So, the onus to clarify the situation is on the Government.

Secondly, whatever Mr. Guruswamy has stated means something because he was closely associated with some persons. He was a person who was in the know of all these transactions and all these things are quite relevant. When a statement has come out in some newspapers, that statement cannot be corroborated by the Opposition. If the government is ready and willing to come forward with such information it should readily do so. It is the duty of the Government to do so. But till today, only the moral stand of the Government has been made known. The Government has not come forward with any document. No document concerning any transanction has been supplied by the Government. We are not aware of any decision of the Cabinet to this effect. The other thing is, "Why has he expressed such an opinion?" That opinion was of public nature. He has said so because he was every close to the Minister. The Minister had confidence in him. As a result of that, he has stated all these things. These are all very relevant facts. The onus to prove all these things is on the Government. The other thing is that the former financial advisor has given opinion on a matter of general interest relating to existence of relationships. He has expressed his opinion which is quite relevant to the matter in question. He has full knowledge of the transaction as he was the advisor to the Minister. He has made all these things public only after he was sacked from his job. An allegation of fixation of price for certain categories of imported steel has been made against the Government. The documents are with the Government, not with the Opposition. So, the onus for making the position clear lies on the Government. What has the Financial Advisor stated? He has said: "Lobbied with other persons." If they are honest, if they believe in the concept of transparency and if they are efficient, they can produce documents in support of these things. These things could be proved by documents only, not by mere statements. Secondly, as they are disowning...

20-296 GIPMR/99

"A man shall not be permitted to 'blow hot and cold'." What the Government is presently saying that; "he was our Adviser", and is again disowning. Sir, they cannot be allowed to blow hot and cold. "A man shall not be permitted to 'blow hot and cold' with reference to the same transaction, or insist, at different times, on truth of each of the two conflicting allegations. This is an elementary rule of logic." Sir, this is an elementary rule of logic. "Such a principle has its basis in common sense." What is common sense? What signal is going to the nation as a whole when their own appointees had stated something against the Government, something against the Prime Minister? When they themselves say 'we want to be honest, we want to be transparent', the onus lies on them.

Lastly, Sir, the burden is solely on the Government. The Government should come with the facts. Therefore, Sir, our demand for JPC is justified. Thank you, Sir, for allowing me to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Venkaiah Naidu not here. Mr. Salve.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Mr. Chairman in the chair): Thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak. It is unfortunate that the intent and purpose for which we have raised this debate, and for which we have asked for constitution of a Joint Parliamentary Committee has not at all been properly appreciated. One of the finest speeches I heard, an absolute example of restraint, the maximum restraint, and circumspection, was by or that of Dr. Manmohan Singh. For 30 years I have been in Parliament, Sir. In politically explosive matters—you have also been there for quite some time—people are apt to lose their balance and indulge in Hyde Park oratory as I have seen just now, a little while ago. He was so restrained, he was so circumspect about the subject, but, unfortunately, his speech was interrupted, about which I felt a little hurt because our real intent and purpose has not been properly appreciated. I don't want that to happen at least now.

Sir, I want to reiterate unequivocally and categorically as to what our real purpose and intent is in having the debate. It is not that we want to level any charge of bribery, nor do we want to level any charge of corruption, and, for that matter, evey of impropriety against the Prime Minister or any of the Ministers, in any manner, whatsover, on the basis of allegations which have been made by Shri Guruswamy. That is not our intent, for God's sake. Both Mr. Jethmalani and Mr. Shourie argued upon an assumption as though we had levelled charges. We have not given the allegations the sanctity of a charge-sheet in a criminal court. In a criminal court, Sir, if a charge-sheet *prima facie* does not carry adequate proof, adequate material, to *prima facie* establish the culpability of the person concerned, the charge-sheet stands dismissed. But we are not giving these allegations the sanctity of a charge-sheet. All that we are saying is, allegations have been made. And no one denies that the allegations are serious. They have been called flimsy, they have been called baseless, but no one said that they are not serious.

So far as the functioning of the Government is concerned, the allegation cast very serious, adverse reflections on the ethics and norms of fair, just and honest governance. And, if that be so, are we not entitled to ask for constitution of a forum, a credible forum, which will enquire into those allegations and find out the veracity of those allegations? That is all we want, Sir. I think this aspect should be borne in mind when the Finance Minister replies to the debate, that we are not giving these allegations the sanctity of a charge-sheet, in any manner, whatsoever.

All that we are saying is that these allegations, being so serious in nature, impinge on the question of functioning of

the Government; on its governance and if the norms of fair and clean governance are sought to be impugned; are sought to be attacked in the allegations, I think it is very important that a credible forum must be established to inquire into the same. So far as I am concerned, I don't put much in store by what a man like Mr. Mohan Guruswamy says. A man who was appointed to a position of trust; appointed to a crucial position of confidence and importance, and who further ceased to be the Advisor, should not have indulged in this kind of a thing. That goes against the cardinal ethics of good professionalism. I don't put much in store by him. But who appointed him? Can it be denied that he was not appointed to a sensitive position? Can it be denied that he was not in a crucial position to know all the things and the subject that he is talking of? If he was in such a position, however flimsy his accusation might be, it is absolutely imperative for the Government to establish a credible forum to go into it.

Sir, may I ask of the Finance Minister, because I have respect for the Finance Minister individually? In fact, he is a strictest Finance Minister who has the reputation of running his Ministry more like a bureaucrat. It is not like an honest politician who is running it. Part of the problems of the economy are on account of his attitude. I will deal with that later when I speak on the Budget. Here, Sir, suffice it to say, would it not be conducive to probity in public life in this country and would it not add to the credibility of this Government, if we inquire into the allegations and determine whether they have any factual basis or not?

In fact, Mr. Arun said, "is there any basis and is there any proof of the allegations? When did we say that there is proof? Not for a moment are we saying that there is any proof. It may have been based on irrelevant material or immaterial considerations. But the crucial question is this. A person who was posted and who worked in such a sensitive position, when he makes such serious allegations, they must not be left unchallenged. They must be inquired into by a credible forum. Mr. Jethmalani said unfortunately, he has left—"JPC is a costly affair and it would be a waste of time of the House to go into it, Specially, when there is no evidence for the allegations made; the allegations are flimsy." Sir, the allegations are bound to be flimsy; they are bound to be called flimsy by Mr. Jethmallani. But who knows whether they are flimsy or not?

Do we take it as *ipse dixit?* Do we accept the *ex cathedra* pronouncement of a Minister that they are flimsy? Therefore, how can they be called flimsy without being enquired into in a credible forum! I would like to know whether they are *prima facie* flimsy and also whether they are true or not.

Sir, there is one other point Mr. Jethmalani made and that was made in a Hyde Park oration style. He says that there were two differences. "When the ministers are working in a Cabinet form of Govt; there are bound to be differences. What is wrong if there are differences between the Home Minister and the Prime Minister? It only shows that there is vibrant democracy in this country." It is true. It is absolutely true, that if these differences were on issues related to public weal and public welfare, if they related to principles of either public administration or public policies. But what is the allegation? These differences arose because the Prime Minister patronised 'X' business house and the Home Minister wanted to know as to 'Y' business house should be patronised. Is this kind of a situation going to be conducive in bringing about a healthy growth of democracy? Is this what a vibrant democracy is all about? But that is the allegation. As I have already said, I don't put much in store by what he said. But the most crucial question is this. When you put a man in a crucial position, and he makes such an

allegation, a very serious allegation on a question of the cardinal, basic ethical norms of fair, clean and good governance, then it is the requirement of democracy, it is the requirement of probity in public life that it must be inquired into. And if Mr. Jethmalani thinks that it is waste of money, to constitute JPC it does not lie in the mouth of a BJP Minister to talk about JPC like that. The JPC has been constituted so many times, and we have been asked to constitute a JPC on far more flimsy grounds than this by B.J.P.

Sir, I had myself faced this on Enron when I was the Minister of Power. A counter-guarantee was given as a matter of policy to eight or nine fast track power projects including Enron. Was it not the BJP? Was it not Mr. Mahajan? Weren't they all after me to say, "Why have you given a counter-guarantee? Should we not inquire into it?" As regards this counter-guarantee, they implied *mala fides* against me and against the Chief Minister of Maharashtra. There was no basis. Nothing of that kind. That was a decision of the Cabinet. Without any allegations by anybody, of corruption, they said, "because the counter-guarantee is given it must be inferred that there is corruption involved in it and, therefore, a JPC must go into it". Today, he is preaching us the gospel that a JPC is a waste of time. What is he talking about? Otherwise, if he is sincere about it, he would have said, "All right, these allegations are serious". He didn't say that they were not serious. In such a situation, what is an alternative credible forum which can inquire into it? Do we go in for a commission of inquiry? Where do we go? After all, I submit that this is in the larger interest of the country's democracy, as also the credibility of this Government. This Government has very little credibiltiy. It is a rag-tag coalition. Unfortunately, every second day, every party, at the drop of a hat, is wanting to wriggle out of the support, wanting to withdraw the support, until they get their pound of flesh. The Government's credibility itself is not very high, unfortunately. This is a harsh political reality and this kind of things are coming on the top of it. It will add to the credibility of the government also, if these allegations are inquired into, ascertained and determined, what sort of blackmail this hon. man, who was appointed as Finance Adviser by no less a person than the Finance Minister himself, is doing. That should be the approach which we should have.

In view of the limited time that I have, I would only like to refer to two or three issues. I have studied the entire matter in great detail. Since many issues have already been raised, I would not like to repeat them. I would only like to highlight two or three issues in respect of which these allegations have been made by Mr. Guruswamy.

The first one relates to the existence of a coterie in the Prime Minister's Office. The allegation is that power-brokers are operating right from the residence of the Prime Minister. If the allegation was made by me, who had never visited the Prime Minister except once—I went for a cup of tea when the Indian team was invited—if it was made by someone who had nothing to do with the Prime Minister's residence, who had nothing to do with the administration, who had nothing to do with the functioning of the Government, who didn't have to deal with the Government day-to-day, that there was a coterie functioning or power-brokers were functioning from the residence of the Prime Minister, we could have said, "this fellow is a good for nothing. He has no *locus standi* whatsoever to make this kind of an allegation". But this man does have a *locus standi* to make an allegation because he worked in that area as administrator. I don't say, for a moment, what he says is true and correct. I also do not say that it is by a hon. man. I submit that it was made by a man who is knowledgeable about things. He did know the happenings; he did know the

events that were going on. He did know how things were working. If such a man makes an allegation that power-brokers are working right from the House of the Prime Minister itself, is it not a matter which should be inquired into by a credible forum? It will exonerate the Prime Minister. I personally have great respect for the Prime Minister for his moderation, for his balance. In fact, I personally consider that if they are sitting there on the treasury benches, it is because 50 per cent of the votes have come on account of the image of the Prime Minister, which is sought to be soiled like this. Would it not defame him? I ask sincerely, "Would it not defame him?". (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: He said that he was not in the administrative loop. He had himself said that he was not in the administrative loop. He, the so-called Adviser, the sacked Adviser, had also said that he was not sitting there. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, I did not yield. But I heard what he had said. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: The Minister will answer. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: He has read all those arguments. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, what I want to submit is this. What Mr. Guruswamy says is here with me. I am not repeating.

I do not, repeat not, levelling any charges of corruption, either against him or against the Prime Minister. No; not for a moment. What is the allegation? Allegation is, it is well known that the coterie was opposed to the Tata Airlines. "There is a coterie around Mr. Vajpayee, headed by his adopted son-in-law, which meddle with matters involving governance." If the coterie is functioning from the residence of the Prime Minister, it is a bunch of power-brokers, nothing else, nothing short of it. Are we committing any impropriety or are we exceeding our responsibility, as Oppostion Members — with such a restraint Dr. Manmohan Singh spoke—our duty in asking for a credible forum or authority to inquire into this kind of an allegation that there are a bunch of power brokers working from the very residence of the Prime Minister — I repeat again — made by somebody who is in the know of things? It is not denied that he did not know things. Mr. Ram Jethmalani did not by a sentence say that "no, no", the fellow could not have known anything. He said "He could have known, but what he says is not based on anything". Mr. Arun Shourie's argument was, where is the proof? Where do I say there is proof? Please don't attach to these allegations. We have not attached to these allegations the sanctity of a charge-sheet in a criminal court. In a criminal court, if that kind of a charge-sheet is to be presented, there has to be a *prima facie* proof of the culpability of that person. We do not for moment, hold that there is any *prima facie* proof of culpability, either of the Finance Minister or of the Home Minister or any other Minister; none whatsoever, take it from me. But these allegations are there by a person who has been holding a sensitive position. We have to go into it in the interest of probity in public life. Do not try to stall it unnecessarily. It may suit your political convenience, but if you are talking of the larger interests — as Mr. Jethmalani waxed eloquent — large interests of democracy, large interests of porbity in public life, then do not try to stall it for political expediency. It is stated by Shri Gurumurthy,

AN HON. MEMBER: Shri Guruswamy...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: I am sorry, Shri Guruswamy; I apologise, Shri Guruswamy. Whether it is Guruswamy or Gurumurthy or somebody, name does not matter. The kind of man that he is, I cannot have much respect for him. Out

of sheer disgust, he says, and persistent double-talk, and ambivalent attitude of the Government, in September, 1998, the been entered into, let us honour them; and the only redeeming feature — I said at that time — was that it was a small plant of 650 MW. It was a baseload station. A baseload station means that you have got to buy certain amount of power from that station. 95% of the power generated has to be purchased, even if you don't need it, in non-peaking hours. The plants of the Maharashtra State Electrity Board, which generate power at one rupee, would have to be closed down and we will have to purchase power at three rupees because that is a baseload station. The only redeeming feature was that it was a 650 MW power station, a small power station; we could carry on with it. It is located in an area, which is environmentally fragile. That was the main ground on which they won the elections in 1995 in Maharashtra. There was also one serious drawback, and it was that, the entire tarrif was determined in terms of dollars. Even if the money has to be paid to the people in India, say, for administration, if interest is to be paid in India, or, even for depreciation, it has to be paid in terms of dollars. And fluctuations in currency meant so much. At least, the Indian expenditure should have been covered by Indian rupees. These were the three objections that I had. I pleaded vehemently. I shouted my lungs out that having entered into the agreement, let us, for God's sake, bear with it because it is a small project of 650 MW; we will be able to absorb it, just to honour the Government's commitment to Enron. Then, comes in the BJP Government in Maharashtra. What happens? Not only did they continue with the first phase, they entered into the second phase. They made it 2,650 MW. It is the same baseload station. It is the same payment in terms of dollars. A very interesting situation arose. The matter was referred to the Bombay High Court in a writ, that the contract between Enron and the Government of Maharashtra should be cancelled because there was corruption. And in that proceeding when the Government said — the Government was a party to it — they found no corruption and that it wants to withdraw all the allegations that it had made, the High Court said, "Nothing doing., You come and tell us on what basis did you earlier cancel the contract". Why did you cancel the contract because, for cancellation of the contract, we are paying a price today? Even today, Mr. Yashwant Sinha pays a price for it. Nobody trusts us abroad. That was the day when we started losing our credibility abroad. Now, what happens? There is a serious allegation made against Enron. It is stipulated that only 40% of their borrowings would be raised in India from the domestic market; they have exceeded this limit. That is the allegation that is being made. You bring an onerous, cumbersome, power project, full of liability, expand it to four times or five times the capacity, agree to pay in dollar terms, unnecessarily involving a drain on the foreign exchange of the country in an area which is environmentally so fragile, even for 650 MW, you make it to 2650 MW; and now, this kind of a liberty is being given. What inference do you want the entire Parliament to draw? What inference would you draw from this kind of an attitude, which you oppose so much here and, suddenly, you do the opposite outside? I mean, is it political expediency, political opportunism, that must govern our country like this?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: That is called education.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: They said that it was for education; who is being educated and who is being graduated, we don't know. "The money was spent," it was an allegation. The Enron there, in one of the workshops, it seems, said, when they asked a question; why was this money; was it part of some preliminary expenses, incurred "it was for education purposes" was the reply. I remember, the

Home Minister making very irresponsible statments saying "for whose education, who is going to graduate from Enron university?" That was the attitutde and approach of absolute disrespect. They were scoffing at that kind of an attitude on the part of Enron at that time; and now, Sir, this Enron is being allowed unlimited liberty, in violation of the terms of the contract, to raise moneys in India beyond 40 per cent of what they are entitled to.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Salveji, they have now been educated. Earlier they were not educated. Now, they are educated. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: That is detrimental to the interests of the economy. ...*(Interruptions)*...

Sir, there is only one more point that I would like to refer to because I have dealt with it, and I am done. There is only one more point, Sir, that is about the Hinduja plant in Vizag. The Hinduja plant was one of the plants for which counter-guarantee had been agreed to. Never was an objection raised against that counter-guarantee here. Anyway, that was at least one sensible thing. What happend to the counter-guarantee was, against the guarantee of the State Government in case of failure of the State Electricity Board to pay them dues of the tariff for the power generated and sold to them, so much controversy was created over that. Then, what happened, Sir? I was still in the Power Ministry then. Hinduja came to me and said, "We are going to draw our coal, and we are going to get supplies of our coal from Orissa. And the Railways situation being what it is, if we are not supplied coal in accordance with their committment to us, then we will get into default, and we will loss heavily, so far as our liability is concerned, to supply power at a particular rate, and there will be heavy loss. Therefore, the Railways must give us some guarantee." I didn't understand the rationale of what they were saying. I said, "Why do you want the Railways' guarantee, we already have so much difficulty with counter-guarantee?" They said, "Unless that is given, our financers are not going to give us any finance." then, I said, "The Railway should take care of the problem." I referred the matter to the Railways. It seems, ultimately, the Railways gave a guarantee that in case they suffer any loss, and don't receive the money they are entitled to from the State Electricity Board, for the failure of the Railways to supply coal according to the time-schedule, then they would bear the liability. But, according to the Railway laws, they will be liable only for up to the double the value of the coal or the consignment. They cannot go beyond twice. So, if the loss was much more than twice the value of the consignment, who is to make good? Then, what happened, Sir? The company, Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd., came into the picture that in case the Railways don't pay the entire loss, they would do so. Mahanadi Coalfields gave a guarantee, we will make good the money to you." But, Mahanadi Coalfields was a very small company, that is a Government of India company. It is a very important point I am making, for Mr. Yashwant Sinha to reply. A Government of India company, a public sector undertaking, gave a counter-guarantee to the guarantee of the Railways and then what happened? It was found that Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd. was not a company which had adequate assets; the excess of assets over liabilities was not adequate to cover the guarantee. They asked for a counter-guarantee from the Government of India against the guarantee of the Mahanadi Coalfields unheard of, Sir. Then, what happened? This is what the allegations say. Mr. Jethmalani said that there was only one allegation; that the Prime Minister was making announcements of building up large national high ways, without the moneys required for it. "It is very vague, general." I concede that I don't count on that allegation, but he forgot to read the allegation, the very important allegation, "Finally, the P.M. got his way-just the

other day; nobody is now talking about serving jail sentence any more." It was being said in the allegation that this type of counter-guarantee was give by the Government of India to Mahandi Coalfileds for making good the losses of the Hindujas consequent upon the failure of the railway to deliver coal in time according to the schedule. The guarantee given by the Mahanadi Coalfileds had to be covered by a counter-guarantee by the Government of India. It was said in the Ministry, "If this happens we will go to jail." Finally when the PM got it done, nobody now talks of going to jail. Sir, I would ask Mr. Arun Shourie when he says that a counter guarantee is given whether it is the policy of the Government of India to give this type of counter-guarantee. Have they given this type of guarantee to any other power projects? Why have Hindujas been chosen? Why are they being treated favourably? I am all for this kind of help which we need to give to the power projects because we need power desperately in this country. But, you cannot pick and choose. Suhartoism crony capitalism was being talked about. Mr. Jethmalani has given his own version. Mr. Guruswamy has his own definition. He says, "Obstensibly under the free economy, you patronise some Houses. That is Suhartoism. There is a charge on the Government in his allegation that business houses are being patronaged selectively. That must not happen. Is it not a charge on the basic norms of fair, honest and clean Government? In view of the allegations made by Shri Guruswamy, that kind of an image persists today. We do not put much in store. We do not levy any charge of corruption or bribery or even impropriety. But, now this has come up. Please do not circumvent it. Please do not put it aside by technical agruments or by methods of Hyde park oratory. You try to understand the real problem of the situation in a dignified manner as has been asked by Dr. Manmohan Singh. With the highest restraints, I want to repeat that rarely does one see restraint in such a politically explosive debate in the House. Please accede to it because it would be good for the country. It would be good for the country and it will help the democracy. It will also help your Government and the Finance Minister. Thank you.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am sorry, I was not here when my name was called. I have some diabetes problem. So, I had gone out to eat something. I apologise that I was not present when my name was called. ...(*Interruptions*)... I have taken some calories. Now, I want to burn them. Sir, there seemed to be some kind of misunderstanding when I interrupted Shri Jitendra Prasadji in the morning. I would submit to the House and to him also that I am not in the habit of interrupting. I only wanted to bring to his notice that he was saying something which was not said by Mr. Guruswamy. I raised an objection and the hon. Chairman said that if there was any such reference that would be removed. This much I want to submit to Jitendra Prasadaji through the Chair. Sir, I had great expectations of this debate because when I heard Manmohan Singhji, Jitendra Prasadaji, my friend, Mr. Salis from the Marxist Party, Shri Salveji, who have great experience and who are all stalwarts, I thought that they must be ready with some material and the Government had to offer its defence. Now after hearing all the speakers, I have come to the conclusion that there is no need for any reply at all because it proved to be a *damp squib*. It would proved to be a *dump squib* becaue everybody from Manmohan Singhji to the last speaker was saying that he was not making any allegation. Everyone is sayingthat they do not have proof. Everyone is saying this ...(*Inuerruption*)... You must be having some proof against them. That is a different matter. Sir, if there is no proof and if they are not taking the responsibility and if they do not have any proof, then what is that we are debating? With regard to Suzuki, steel prices and such other issues these have been discussed in the House earlier. And you have

other forms of discussing them again. And, then, you have the Standing Committee to go into all these things and you can really go in for the details in the Standing Committee and have your own information. But, asking for a Joint Parliamentary Committee for something where there is no allegation, no basis, no proof and nobody is owning the responsibility, but still talking about it, really puzzles me. I had said this earlier in the House. I am saying it again with all conveiction. I have the highest regard for the Leader of the Opposition. Next to my Prime Minister, if I respect anybody, politically, on the other side, it is the Leader of the Opposition. But I must submit with all respect that he did not and could not—I know that he has got conscience—make any allegation and make any substantial point to say that a J.P.C. is needed. Sometime back, I saw a photo in a magazine. The magazine had printed, on the front page, a nude photograph of somebody and written, under that photo, "*dekhiye desh kis taraf jarahahai.*" Sir, publishing a nude photograph is "Yellow journalism." And making a comment is to print that photograph. Here, everybody is saying...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Which magazine is that?...(*Interruptions*)... We are discussing about the articles and interviews pertaining to Mr. Mohan Guruswamy. He should not go beyond that ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: You have gone beyond that.

You went to Dirubhai Ambani because you are so fond of him. I am not going there...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Reliance is there-...(*Interruptions*)... Nude photograph is not there...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: It is very clear from the last one year that this Government is transparent, clean and honest...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Everything is transparent, so that you can look beyond that...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Nobody, including Mr. Salim, or, anybody from that side, has a moral courage to make any single allegation against my Government—whether it is the Prime Minister or Ministers or anybody. Nobody can make any allegation...(*Interruptions*)... That is the greatest achievement we have made...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, the CBI was informed from the Prime Minister's Office not to raid the Reliance premises. I made a specific allegation. None of you people, who are speaking, have touched that point ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, at page 818 of 'Kaul and Shakdher', it says, "Allegation, based on the newspaper reports, is not allowed unless the Member is tabling to gives the Speaker substantial proof of the allegation and have some factual basis." Not only that, at page 821, it further says, "The details of the charges sought to be levelled are spelt out in precise terms and are duly supported by requisite documents which are to be authenticated by the Member."...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: I am on a point of order...(*Interruption*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me tell you, Mr. Venkaiah Naidu, this point been dealt with yesterday. Please do not repeat it. A ruling has been given. Do not try to repeat it. We are discussing only Guruswamy. Whether it is proved or unproved, the Minister will reply. Please do not waste the time of the House on this.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I am not going into the point of order. I have that much understanding to understand it. I am going into the speeches made by hon. Members. I am right. I am going into the speeches made by the hon. Members. I am not going into the ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: None of them have made any personal charges. So, why do you read it?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I am thankful to you. You have once again clarified that none of them have made any charges either against any Minister or Prime Minister or his office or his relatives. It is fine...(*Interruptions*)... I wanted it to come once again so that it will be reminded to the people. Mr. Mohan Guruswamy is from Hyderabad. He is known to me. He is friend of mine. He joined my party. We worked together. After sometime, he felt that he is not able to carry on with us and then he said that he had resigned and the Government says that the Government have removed him from service. The Government's note says that the Finance Minister had taken a painful decision, of Mohan Guruswamy in public interest, during his tenure as he was acting beyond his mandate. This is what the Finance Minister's statement says. Sir, Mr. Mohan Guruswamy ...

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: What is the date of that statement?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: The Minister will enlighten you better...(*Interruptions*)... you do not ask. It is not Question Hour...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, he is quoting from a statement made by the Finance Minister about the sacking of or accepting the resignation of Guruswamy. We should know the date and where the statement has been made, because it is not laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MAHOUTRA: You cannot read out an official statement like this.

SHRI MD. SALIM: You cannot be a privy to the Minister's statement and the House is not.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Are you the Chairman?

SHRI MD. SALIM: No, I am asking the Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are asking the Chairman by looking at him...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Looking at facts, Sir; because, sometimes, facts say too many things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But you ar asking the Chairman by looking at him. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I do my home work, not to the extent of the leaders on the other side, because they came to the House without any allegations, without any proof and without any basis. Sir, this is a press statement issued on 03.02.1999. It is with me. It is issued by a Department. D.P.I.O, I think he is an information officer. Sir, there are two aspects. Whatever Mr. Guruswamy said, if you put that in a nutshell, namely, he did not make any allegations of corruption. Mr. Guruswamy is not making any allegations of corruption. He has written a signed article in 'Asian Age'. The Opposition is not making an allegation. They do not have proof. Then what else are we discussing here? I am not able to understand. The second issue is, what Guruswamy has said, "some people work, sometimes, they differ; they go, sometimes they are dropped". Even the Marxist Party's great leaders had to leave the party, like Mr. Nripen Chakraborty. Nothing wrong. After leaving the party, if Nripen Chakraborty says 'CPM is corrupt', you are pained. Then, Sir, similarly in the Congress. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JIBON ROY: That was an affair concerning a party; this is an afair of the nation. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Similarly, a lot of people left the Congress Party. They made allegations against the Congress Arjun Singh left the Congress.' Madhavraoji left the Congress. ...(*Interruptions*)... Jitendra Prasadji, I am coming to that. You may also one day have a

change of heart and then may come out here. ...(*Interruptions*)... The final call is nationalism. Sir, anybody after leaving an organisation, can make a statement. An employee, after he is ceased to be an employee, makes an allegation. We all know what is the value of the statement of a person who has taken a divorce. Ex is an Ex. They were insisting on the point — your man, your man. I am saying; my friend'. He is not my man. He is your Guru. He is your Swamy now. ...(*Interruptions*)... I am saying, he is a friend of mine. I am not hiding it. He is from my place Hyderabad. He worked with us. Similarly, he worked with Jan Morcha. He worked with B.B.C. He worked with Chandra Shekharji. He worked with Bommaiji. He worked, for some time, with B.J.P. Now he does not work with us. We do not work with him. He has gone. That is the end of the matter. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: He has worked with so many people, but he never made any allegation. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, if you are going to go by the allegations made by somebody who was earlier in the Government, I can't say anything. Sir, I have a reference by Shri V.P. Singhji. He said, "I faced threat from Congressmen, while in Government, while outside the Government". He said it, not in a routine press conference. If it had been only a simple press statement, I would not have taken it up. He said it before the Commission. He said that he faced greater threat from congressmen than from militants". ...(*Interruptions*)...

Sir, they can go to the extent of making any allegations. I am not making such allegations. They went to the extent of making an allegation, saying that Narasimha Raoji was soft towards the killers of Rajiv Gandhi. This was also an allegation by the AICC.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: Is this relevant; What are you saying; What are you trying to say?

SHRI MD. SALIM: They have three points—Mr. Nripen Chakraborty, Mr. V.P.Singh and Mr. Narasimha Rao.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Of relevance is what Mr. M.V. Raghavan and Mrs. K.R. Gauriamma said after leaving their party.

So, let us not go by the statements of the people who left an organisation or a Government or a party. They are aggrieved because they have been sent out of the party. They are aggrieved because they have beer out of the post. They are aggrieved because they were relieved of their responsibility. They will have their own viewpoints.

He has not made any allegations of corruption. With regard to political things, he is not authorised to make any allegations because he was not a politician. He had a Government job. He quit the Government job. According to him, he has quit the job. According to the Government, he has been dropped from the Government job. What is the moral authority of a person who has been dropped? ...(*Interruptions*)...

It is an appointment; to my level of understanding of English.

Here, the other issues which Mr. Guruswamy has raised are more of a political nature. But what I am trying to impress upon you is this. Yesterday, I tried to raise this. My conscience even today tells me that this august House should not be allowed to discuss baseless allegations. This is my appeal to the entire House. This is my appeal to the people also. There is no basis in this. Mr. Jitendra Prasad has gone to the extent of saying, "If I had the proof, you would have been in jail by this time." I am thankful to you,;

यह आपने कहा था।

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: मैंने यह कहा था कि हमारे अरुण शौरी ने यह कहा था कि

News reports have not been substantiated.

यह उन्होंने कल कहा था। हमने कहा था कि यह न्यूज़ रिपोर्ट सबस्टैंशिएट करने की जरूरत नहीं है

because they have been made by a very senior official of your Government. He was the Advisor to the Finance Minister. What is their to substantiate? These are interviews and articles. You spoke about evidence. All others have also said that if the evidence was there, you would have been in jail.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Exactly. You are right.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: He was with you. He was your confidant. He was a senior official of your Ministry. You have to clear the clouds. He has levelled all kinds of allegations against you.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: So, Sir, the matter is very clear. Had there been an iota of evidence, either we would have been in court or we would have gone to jail. As there is not even an total of evidence, there is no need for an inquiry. This is what you have said. This is the simple question.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: The evidence is in your file.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: You don't make any allegations.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: You have a JPC. We will give you the evidence.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: If Parliament is not able to get any evidence, and nobody is coming forward before Parliament with any piece of evidence and nobody is making allegations inside Parliament, what is a Parliamentary Committee going to do? ...*(Interruptions)*...

If there is any evidencce, give the evidence. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM: He is making a false statement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: This idea is very simple. The other Chairman is standing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you yielding?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I am not yielding, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding. Please sit down.

SHRI MD. SALIM: He is misleading the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding to you. Finish.

SHRI MD. SALIM: I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. It is a point of disorder.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, Jitendra Prasadji has rightly said, "Had there been any evidence, either you would have been in court or you would have gone to jail," 'You' means people. You are fair to me, and I am fair to you. Let us be fair to the truth also. Sir, my point is that there is no evidence. If somebody goes to the court without any evidence, what will happen to that? There is no allegation, no evidence, no information; and you say conduct an inquiry Who will accept it?

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: Sir, he has said something. Let me clarify it. Sir, an allegation has been levelled by the former advisor in the Government. Now, those allegations have to be investigated and charges framed. Unless and until you form a JPC how is the whole thing going to be investigated? Our point is that allegations have been made. There is a *prima facie* case.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Unless a *prime facie* case is made before the House, you cannot go in for any inquiry. You cannot ask for a JPC to inquire into the fact whether there is a basis for it or not. It was never done. Sir, the entire purpose of their approach seems to be this. For the last nearly 12 months they could not find a single allegation against my Government or my leader. During the last one year they made all attempts to destablise the Government. They failed in that. In the last one year they have tried to come together...

SHRI MD. SALIM: It was your allies who tried to...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: My allies are with me.

Sir, he spoke on the point as to what we have been able to achcive and what we have not been able to achieve. I am coming to that point. Their attempt is; if nothing is there, at least try to create some suspicion. Sir, I have this paper before me. I would like the Chairman to take note of it. I would like the House to take a serious note of this. This newspaper says: "RS to discuss corruption charges today. This is the headline of a newspaper. Here, noboby is making any charge and nobody is making any allegation, but the nation is discussing about a dissent. This is an attempt to tarnish the image of the Government without any basis...(*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't listen to them.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: If my friend, Mr. Guruswamy, is a Government appointee, he has follow the rules and he has to abide by official secrecy. If he is not doing so, he is a political person. He went there because of the expertise he had on the so-called subject, and then the Government thought it fit that he was not suitable to the Government. So, he came out.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Sir, he is now saying that he came out. Earlier he was saying that he was dropped.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I did not say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know why you respond to them, Mr. Venkaiah Naidu. Let them go on talking. You don't respond to them.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I am sorry, Sir. I have some weakness for my fellow MPs.

Sir, he is making a political point that. With our collective wisdom and experience here, in this House, are we to discuss that? An Advisor in the Expenditure Department of the Finance Ministry, he was...

SHRI MD. SALIM: It is a wrong piece of information. I personally quoted from the circular of your own Finance Ministry's Office that he had been appointed as Advisor to the Finance Minister. Now, he is saying that he was a consultant to the Expenditure Department. Let him say which statement is correct. Please say the truth.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: 'Truth' is not there in your party's dictionary. That is the problem. (*Interruptions*). Sir, the hon. Finance Minister is here. He will clarify the position. Sir, he was designated as Advisor. Morevoer, it is not my responsibility to give this clarification. The hon. Minister is very much here. He will give the clarification.

Sir, my point is that he made certain political issues. I have got a right to reply. I belong to this Government and this party against whom he makes political remarks. Normally, these things are discussed outside the House. He writes an article and I write an article. He gives a speech and I give a speech. We will have our own opinion. Sometimes his opinion may be genuine and he may have genuine concern also. Then, I also have a right to express my opinion.

The point he has raised is, "The top two are not pulling together." Is it a duty of the Advisory? No. I think the entire House agrees with me. ...(*Interruptions*)...

Second, the Prime Minister has gone on record a number of times, including in this very House, looking at his senior colleague, Shri Advaniji, I quote: "There is no problem between us. The problem is for you." ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Guruswamy also commented that Shri Yashwant Sinha was the PM's third choice for the post of Finance Minister. See the comment. Our Members of Parliament want to discuss it. An Advisor is saying this. Thirdly, the Prime Minister

selects his team. He has selected the Finance Minister and the best Finance Minister. The entire country is happy about it. Even the Opposition is silent on the Budget because he has been able to present a wonderful Budget. Inflation is under control. Rupee is stable.

SHRI MD. SALIM: What about non-official members in the Prime Minister's coterie? ..(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, with regard to the Lahore bus trip, he has mentioned in his article...

MR. CHAIRMAN: How long you will take?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, another ten minutes.

Sir, here is a resoulution passed by the Muslim League. The Indian Muslim league at its meeting placed on record, "its deep sense of appreciation for the initiative taken by the Prime Minister, in normalising the relationship with Pakistan and welcomes all his efforts to create an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual understanding. This meeting considers these endeavours of the Prime Minister as realistic, positive and pragmatic. We hope the region will be free from constant threat to peace and security." This is a resolution passed by the Muslim League. My friend, Mr. Guruswamy differ with that. He has got a right to differ with it. We have got a right to defend it because the entire country is appreciating it. America is also happy. China is happy. Even many foreign countries are happy. We have read in the newspapers also that all are happy. If he is not happy we cannot help it. It is his preception. We can't quarrel with him.

Fourth, there is another organisation called the All India Qaumi Tanzeem of which Mr. Tariq Anwar, Member of Parliament, Lok Sabha and a Member of the Congress Working Committee is the President. He has commended the Prime Tatas withdrew a proposal of setting up a domestic airline.' The allegation of the erstwhile adviser is "it is well-known that the coterie was opposed to Tata Airlines' proposal because of the political jet-sets' attachment to a particular Airlines." Sir, the allegation is, perhaps, to aggrandise the interest of one of the private airlines i.e. Jet Airlines, Tatas were not allowed an entry into the aviation field. Sir, not for a moment, do I want to suggest that we should not help Jet Airlines. After all, it is an Indian industry, that is what Dr. Manmohan Singh said. Why do we run down our private sector? I do not want to run down my private sector. Private sector is also an Indian sector. But if there is a public sector, there is a private sector also. If we are shifting towards a market economy, is not competition the very hub, the very basis of free market economy. If that is so, Sir, then the rule which applies for Jet Airlines must also apply for Tata Airlines. And the allegation is Mr. Arun Shourie raised this point — the Prime Minister played a duplicitous role, all through. He would tell his colleagues that like the Home Minister and the Finance Minster, he too was in favour of Tata's proposal; on the other hand, his close Advisers would do everything in their power to stall him. The surreptitious method of wanting to favour one against the other, is it not a very serious allegation? Speaking for myself, I have always been surprised, some Members of Parliament also wanting to say that if Tata Airlines come in, that will jeopardise the interest of Indian Airlines. I am always for competition on equal terms between public sector undertakings and private sector undertakings. That alone with ensure benefit to the consumers, the travelling people. Therefore, just because some Members have said — I am replying to Shri Arun Shourie — that it may cause detriment to Indian Airlines, is an argument is totally irrelevant for these purposes. The argument here is that it is the coterie which, in order to help the Jet Airways, did not want Tata's entry into the Aviation field, and, there-

fore, they scuttled it. Is this not an allegation which needs to be inquired into? We know that it is out of sheer disgust that Tatas have withdrawn. If there is a business house in India which has the highest reputation for integrity, the highest reputation for honesty and the highest reputation for serving and subserving the cause of its consumers and customers, it is the Tatas. Why is it that Tatas have withdrawn like this? Is it not a matter which should be inquired into? I can tell you one thing — I had nothing to do with Tatas. I have had no dealing with them, either in my professional career or otherwise. But, as a citizen of this country, and as a Member of Parliament, I do realise and see how Tatas deal with their customers and consumers, and what the other people do. Tatas is a house with the highest reputation of integrity. If they have gone out, and the allegation is that it is the coterie which has driven them out, I think, it is a matter which needs to be inquired into.

The second point which I would like to refer to is about Suzuki. Unfortunately, the Industry Minister is not here. The allegation is that the Maruti Udyog Limited has been completely taken over by Suzuki. Maruti is one of our flage-bearers, so far as the automobile industry is concerned. It is a most important, a very valuable, public sector undertaking. It has established a dimension of quality of which we are very proud. Now, the allegation is that this company has been taken over by Suzuki. While the Government of India continues to hold a very substantial shareholding in the same, the entire production, purchase and marketing, are all being controlled by Suzuki. And by using the transfer pricing mechanism, Suzuki is siphoning off large funds away from India to Japan. It is very well-known that it is Suzuki which is controlling it. Unfortunately, India's representatives, who are on the Board of Maruti, are no more that absolute stooges of Suzuki. That is the reputation that is going on. If an allegation is made that it is the Industry Ministry, which allowed these things to happen, is it not a matter which, in all fairness, requires to be inquired into? And I would like the Finance Minister, if he is the one who is going to reply to the debate, to tell us as to who is controlling the production, purchase and marketing of Maruti. Is it true that using the transfer pricing mechanism, large amounts of funds have been siphoned off? If this is not so, is he in a position to categorically deny that this is incorrect, this is untrue, this is baseless? Because, this is also a talk that is going on in the market. But I am going only on the basis of the allegations made by him.

Madam, while talking about Enron, which has also been referred to, I would like to say what I had faced on this issue. Enron was considered a great liability of this country. For a 650 MW project, — the Enron project in Dhabol in Maharashtra — I was sitting where the Finance Minister is sitting now — I was grilled by the Opposition for nearly three or four hours.

They were saying: "You cannot give counter-guarantee. Why did you give counter-guarantee?" For more than one hour, I tried to explain it. At that time, they said, "if you give counter-guarantee, it means that corruption is implied in it, and, therefore, the need for a JPC." I said, "Without there being any evidence of corruption anywhere — it is an American company, and American companies cannot pay even a rupee anywhere without any evidence whatsoever — you are inferring corruption from a decision of the Government of India, which was taken by the sanctity of the Cabinet, which was eulogised just now by Shri Ram Jethmalani.

2.00 P.M.

The Cabinet took the decision that for eight fast-track projects this kind of guarantee would be given. That decision was taken before I took over the Ministry. All that I want to submit is that, at that time, I had said that I had certain

reservations about the project itself. But certain agreements had already been entered into. Certain contracts had been entered into and one thing I would never want the Government of India to ever do is to try to wriggle out of a contract that they have entered into with a foreign investor. Nothing damages the reputation of the country outside India more. We need more and more foreign investments coming in. Without that, I don't see how we are going to build our infrastructure. I pleaded and pleaded vehemently with the hon. Members who were sitting on this side that for god's sake, what had happened had happened, agreements had Minister, Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee's peace efforts to improve ties with Pakisatan. He said, "We hope these two countries under the Prime Minister's continue their peace efforts so that their resources and energies are directed not towards preparation for a war, but towards ensuring peace, propserity and stability in the sub-continent." That is the resolution passed by another organisation.

The point is he made an assesment about the Lahore bus trip. His assessment is altogether different from the perception, understanding and conviction of the people of the country. Sir, what else is required?

My friend has raised the Tata Airlines issue. Sir, the Tata Airlines issue also...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: What about Maruti?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: He has raised the issue of Maruti which was discussed threadbare in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why are you responding to him? ...(*Interruptions*)...Why are you becoming their victim? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: The Tata Airlines project was pending since 1995. I think, Shri Manmohan Singh was the Finance Minister. Can anyone attribute motives to Shri Manmohan Singh? Can anybody attribute motives like that?

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): It never came before me. This is not a correct statement.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: It is not clear. I am not able to hear you.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: I think it never came before me for any decision.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: When he says so, I accept it. According to my knowledge, this issue has been pending for the last four years. My Government came to power only 11½ months back. We have seen in this very House, friends cutting across party lines said, "Don't give permission because Indian Airlines will be affected." Giving permission or not giving permission has to be decided by the Government. But attributing motives to the Tata Airlines ...(*Interruptions*)... If you don't want that, then, that is a different thing. The issue of Jet Airlines ...(*Interruptions*)... Sir, Tatas are the nationalist people of the country.

They brought a good name to the country. Why are you just ridiculing the name of Tatas? I just cannot understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You make your points.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, my point is, whether it is Tatas or Jet Airways or NEPC or Modiluft or other private airlines, private airlines were given permission by the previous regime. This Government was considering the issue. Meanwhile, they have withdrawn. How can that be a matter of discussion now, at this time? I just cannot understand. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JIBON ROY: There would be an open sky. No Tata or no Jet will be with you.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, about the National Highway, the entire

nation is feeling happy. Even in the remotest corners of the country, people are thinking that the north and the south and the east and the west are being linked. And then, the Government is very serious about this project. We are very happy and proud that the hon. Prime Minister is taking such an initiative for such innovative steps and he is making such path-breaking measures on issues, major issues, which are facing the country. The country is happy about it. I differ with Mr. Guruswamy. But my friends seem to have taken whatever he says as sacrosanct. It is Bhagvad Gita for them. ...(*Interruptions*)... For you, there is no 'Bhagvad'; there is no'Bhagwan' for you; and we know that at the end, you will be praying 'Bhagwan'.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, I have a point of order. 'Believing' is a fundamental right enshrined in the Constitution. Not believing is also a fundmantal right and he cannot cast asperisons on Members who are non-believers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. He has not cast any aspersion.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, he has cast an aspersion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. has not made any aspersion. I do not think so. Mr. Venkaiah Naidu, please complete your speech now.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, points of order can be raised by people who follow the rules., Now, Sir, he alleges to have suffered due to being close to Advani. Advaniji and other senior leaders are all part of the Government. All of us are working with the inspiration of these leaders. There is nothing wrong if somebody takes inspiration from them. But the point raised by my hon. friends here is this. They are trying to create some differences which do not exist. They are habituated with differences during their regime. Today, all my Party is united; the Government is united; our allies are also now coming closer than before.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is the biggest joke.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: The biggest jokes is that the Parties which called the Congress a Party of blood-suckers, centipedes and what not are coming together. That is the joke of this Century. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up know.

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत: गुरुस्वामी आपके गुरु हो गए हैं।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: सुखराम आपको बहुत सुख दे रहे हैं। सुखराम आपका सुख और चैन हो गया ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: उनको बोलने दीजिए।

श्री जीवन राय: कई दिनों तक पार्लियामेंट नहीं चलने दी और अब ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री एम० वेंकैया नायडु: जो यह कांड हुआ उन्हीं के जमाने में हुआ। उस जमाने को ये सपोर्ट करना चाहते हैं तो हम क्या करें। ...(व्यवधान)... हमारे जमाने में तो कुछ नहीं हुआ, कोई आरोप नहीं लगा ...(व्यवधान)...

Sir, Sukh Ram is a Member of Parliament.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up now. Don't hear what they are saying. You go ahead. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Guruswamy's allegation is that the same regime is continuing, the same type of crooks are there in power ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, he was on an administrative job. The administration thought that he was not suitable for them. He thought that this regime was not suitable to him. So, he has gone and he is writing articles. And he has got a right to write his own views. But my point is, his views, his preception, his understanding, his estimate of people, men, matters,policies, cannot be a matter for this great House and that this House is discussing each and everything written. If we go at this rate,

where will we end-up? Sir, coming back to the main point, I would like to say that after hearing Manmohan Singhji, Jitendera Prasadaji and other leaders, I thought, except responding to the political remarks that they have made, there is nothing substantial to which we have to offer any explanation and there is nothing subnstantial to discuss in this House. My main point is that this regime, in the last one year, is totally free from any scam. They are unhappy about this. Commitment to ideology, commitment to value-based politics, commitment to honesty, probity in public life, is our weakness, and if they say that this our weakness, we cannot help it. Now, they are trying to find out something which is not there and they are not ready even to make an allegation on the floor of the House. I should not use the word "challenge". I call upon them—I heard the senior leaders and then I heard my friend from the CPI(M)-to listen to me. I thought, being a yougster, he will come up with some sort of information which needed some reply. But nothing is there. Everybody is saying: "Guruswamy, Guruswamuy, Guruswamy." Except this, nothing is there. Earlier, what has happened during Narasimha Rao's regime because of one Swamy; I do not want to go into the past history now.

SHRI MD. SALIM: I have referred to the allegations made by Shri Guruswamy. I have levelled this charge here. But you are not touching it. (*Interruptions*) Sir, he has referred to my speech. (*Interruptions*) You come up with some documents to show that you are not lobbying (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Naidu, have you finished your spech?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Unless a Member making an allegation takes upon himself the responsibility and brings the facts before the House, simply saying. "challenges, come on, come on," will not do.

हम को कुछ और काम नहीं है क्या? हमें सरकार चलानी है। अच्छा काम कर के दिखाना है। जनता की सेवा करनी है। यहां ऐसी बेमतलब बातें कर के समय वेस्ट नहीं करना है। इसीलिए हमने सोचा है—

This does not deserve any inquiry even by a JPC because no Member of the House so far has been able to come forward even with an iota of evidence. No Member has the moral authority to make any allegation against the leaders or the Government, except that they are just trying to create something. There is no fire. They are trying to create a smoke.But it will not catch. I can only end up by saying; whether it is Prime Minister or Home Minister or Finance Minister, we are proud of them, the entire country is proud of them ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA: You will come to know about it.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: You, and not me. But you are proud of him. You are reciting "Guru, Guru" in the morning and evening. Finally, I end up by saying that if you try to spit on the sun, it will fall on you own face. Please don't venture to cast aspersions on the great leader of this country, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Thank you.

श्री अमर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): मान्यवर, मोहन गुरुस्वामी कांड के बारे में सदन में और अखबारों में काफी चर्चा रही। इसका सूत्रपात स्टील सेक्टर की एक बड़ी कम्पनी को विशेष रूप से आर्थिक पैकेज दिए जाने की पहल से हुआ। मैं आपके संज्ञान में और आपके माध्यम से सदन के संज्ञान में यह तथ्य लाना चाहता हूं कि समाजवादी पार्टी ने प्रधानमंत्री के स्तर पर सब से पहले इस मामले को उठाया था। 200 डालर की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय एच०आर०ओपेल वित्त मंत्री, वाणिज्य मंत्री और अन्यान्य अधिकारियों की समिति द्वारा प्रस्तावित 247 डालर के मूल्य के स्थान पर 402 डालर का मूल्य निर्धारित करती है। सरकार बताए कि पिछले चार महीनों में इस नोटीफिकेशन से कितनी राशि का लाभ किन-किन कम्पनियों को किस अनुपात में हुआ? अभी तक कहा गया कि हम अखबार की कतरनों के बारे में बात कर रहे हैं और कोई ठोस बात नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैं इस सदन के संज्ञान में लाना चाहता हूं कि 18 मार्च को, जो आने

वाला 18 मार्च है, विश्वस्त सूत्रों से जो मुझे ज्ञात हुआ है कि स्टील सेक्टर की तीन कंपनियों को एक प्रस्ताव के द्वारा आई०डी०बी०आई० इस्पात, एस्सार स्टील और ऊषा को मोटी रकम देने जा रही है। उनका हाल सुनिए। सितम्बर 30, 1998 तक इस्पात इंडिया और दूसरे ग्रुप को 3 हजार करोड़ तक आई०डी०बी०आई० द्वारा दिया जा चुका है जो आई०डी०बी०आई० के कुल नेटवर्क का, 8 हजार करोड़ रुपए का लगभग 11.7 परसेंट और 24.4 परसेंट है। दूसरी वित्तीय संस्थाओं जैसे कि आई०एफ०सी०आई० और यू०टी०आई० के विरोध के बावजूद 300 करोड़ का नया कर्ज इस्पात को दिए जाने का प्रस्ताव है आगामी 18 मार्च को। इस कंपनी के पास स्टील में लगाने के लिए पैसा नहीं है। लेकिन क्या विडम्बना है कि डी०टी०एच० डायरेक्ट टु होम सेटेलाइट परियोजना में लगाने के लिए 400 करोड़ रुपया है। स्टील सेक्टर के लिए स्टील सेक्टर के लिए आई०डी०बी०आई० पैसा दे और पैकेज मांगे और डायरेक्ट टु होम सेटेलाइट के लिए 400 करोड़ रुपया इनके पास है। क्या कोई गारंटी है कि स्टील के लिए दिया जाने वाला 300 करोड़ डी०टी०एच० में इस्पात ग्रुप नहीं झोंक देगा। एक परियोजना के लिए पाया धन दूसरी परियोजना में लगाने की परंपरा में, डाइवर्सीफिकेशन आफ फंड में हमारे देश के उद्योगपति काफी अग्रणी है।

ऊषा की कहानी भी ऐसी ही है। 18 मार्च को स्टील पैकेज के नाम पर ऊषा को साढ़े तीन सौ करोड़ का पारितोषिक दिए जाने का प्रस्ताव है। सिर्फ 1200 करोड़ रुपया इन्होंने आई०डी०बी०आई० का ले रखा है जो आई०डी०बी०आई के कुल नेटवर्क का 10 परसेंट है। उल्लेखनीय है कि मूल तो छोड़ दें जो रकम उन्होंने ली है उस पर ब्याज तक नहीं देने के बावजूद यह नया कर्ज इन कंपनियों को देने का प्रयास हो रहा है।

सबसे बड़ा स्टील स्कैम एस्सार का है। इनकी मदद—यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूं, यह गुरुघंटाल गुरूस्वामी कह रहे हैं—केंद्रीय गृह मंत्री माननीय लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी के इशारे पर किए जाने का आरोप गरू गरूस्वामी जी का है जिसका खंडन आज तक गृह मंत्री जी द्वारा नहीं किया गया है। वित्त मंत्री जी का कहना है कि एडवाइजर अपने को वित्त मंत्री समझ बैठा इसलिए निकालना पड़ा। मैं नहीं जानता कि सत्य क्या है। पर गड़बड़ जरूर कुछ है।

संसद और संसद के माध्यम से देश को पता लगना चाहिए कि स्टील को आई०डी०बी०आई० ने कितना दिया है—747 करोड़, भुगतान हुआ 606 करोड़, बकाया है 601 करोड़। सिर्फ ब्याज का बकाया है। 142 करोड़। एस्सार ग्रुप का कुल एक्सपोजर आई०डी०बी०आई० द्वारा है। —पूरे ग्रुप का। यह स्टील सेक्टर के अलावा है। ऋण जो सैक्शंड है वह 2237 करोड़ है जो डिसबर्स हो गया है वह है 1547 करोड़। एक्सपोजर है 2206 करोड़ और ओवरड्यू है सिर्फ 206 करोड़। मूल तो नहीं देना, ब्याज भी नहीं देना, पैसे पर पैसा सरकार से लेना और विदेशों में नयी-नयी कंपनियां खरीदना? पैसा नहीं है उनके पास—स्टील पैकेज के लिए एस्सार ग्रुप के पास, भुगतान करने के लिए विदेशों में कंपनियों खरीदने के लिए बहुत पैसा है। खबर लगती है कि इंडोनेशिया में कंपनियां खरीद रहे हैं। बड़े-बड़े शेयर हैं। अगर उनको लिक्विडेट कर दें तो सारा कर्ज खत्म हो जाएगा। लेकिन कहते हैं कि अगर एफ०सी०एन० जो हैं हम नहीं देंगे तो देश का नाम डूब जाएगा।

मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी से आश्वासन चाहूंगा कि एक ऐसा व्हाइट पेपर बनाएं जिसमें देश की खस्ता औद्योगिक हालत को मद्देनजर रखते हुए प्रावधानों की पारदर्शिता के साथ वित्तीय संस्थाएं रुग्ण औद्योगिक इकाइयों की मदद करें। मैं उद्योगों के विरोध में नहीं हूं। मैं खुद उद्योगपति हूं । सिलेक्टिव तरीके से स्टील ही क्यों और स्टील में सबसे पहले एस्सार क्यों, सेल क्यों नहीं और दूसरे बीमार जो बच्चे हैं क्या वे आपके बच्चे नहीं है। सीमेंट क्यों नहीं, टेक्सटाइल क्यों नहीं, केमिकल उद्योग क्यों नहीं, पेपर इंडस्ट्री क्यों नहीं। पूरे देश के लगभग सभी उद्योगों में रिसेशन है। पर कृपा सिर्फ स्टील सेक्टर पर क्यों और उसकी एक कंपनी पर क्यों?

यहां वित्त के बड़े-बड़े जानकार बैठे हुए हैं। आदरणीय मनमोहन सिंह जी बैठे हुए है। क्यों नहीं हम छोटी-छोटी बातों से उबरकर अपने विराट क्षमता वाले इस देश को आर्थिक संकट से उबारने के लिए क्रोनी कैपिटलिज्म की जगह, सिलेक्टिव एप्रोच की जगह कलेक्टिव एप्रोच लगाएं और पारदर्शिता से ऐसा कुछ करें कि सब कुछ ठीक-ठाक हो। जब तक ऐसा नहीं होता है मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी और सरकार से आश्वासन चाहूंगा कि कम से कम आने वाली 18 मार्च को आई०डी०बी०आई० की बैठक में होने वाले आपत्तिजनक क्रोनी कैपिटलिज्म से आप बचाएं। वित्त मंत्री जी आप ही ने एक स्पीच दी थी कि आपके जो दूसरे रुग्ण बच्चे हैं—पेपर वाले, टेक्सटाइल वाले और तमाम दूसरे बच्चे वे दिल से पूछेंगे कि हम आपके हैं कौन। आपको बताना होगा कि आप उनके हैं कौन। आपको दिल से बोलने की आदत है। आपको यह संतुष्ट करने की आदत

है आप संतुष्ट करते हैं कि हम आपके हैं कौन। तो आज जरा बताएं...

तो आप जरा अपने दिल से बताइये कि टैक्सटाइल और एस्सार सिर्फ दिल से यही आपके हैं और दूसरे पूछ रहे हैं, दिन से, हम आपके हैं कौन, तो आप चुपचाप बैठे हैं। तो यह मत करिए। ...(व्यवधान)... जहां तक सवाल यह है कि यह कहा गया है कि कोई आरोप नहीं है, अखबार की कतरनों को पढ़ करके हम लोग बोल रहे हैं, तो हम बताना चाहते हैं, बड़ी धर्म के ऊपर आस्था है, मुझे भी है, तो रामायण में विभीषण एक पात्र था। विभीषण अगर नहीं बताता कि रावण की हत्या कैसे होगी तो रावण नहीं मरा होता। अगर गुरु, गुरुस्वामी नहीं होते तो ये बड़े-बड़े घोटालों का पता नहीं चला होता। इस लिए विभीषण गुरू गुरूस्वामी ने जो बताया कि कहां-कहां पाप का भंडार है तो उसके बारे में विचलित मत होइए, चिंतित मत होइए और अगर दूध का दूध और पानी का पानी है तो एक व्हाइट पेपर बनाइये, पार्लियामेंट की कोई कमेटी मनमोहन सिंह जी की अध्यक्षता में बनाइये। अगर आपको चिंता है, स्टील पैकेज की चिंता है तो पेपर पैकेज भी बनाइये, कैमिकल पैकेज भी बनाइये टैक्सटाइल पैकेज भी बनाइये और अगर सब से पहले कोई चीज़ उठानी है स्टील सैक्टर में तो आपकी कंपनी बड़ी प्रेस्टीजियस कंपनी थी सेल, आपको सेल की चिंता सब से पहले होनी चाहिए। मैं देश के वित्त मंत्री आदरणीय यशवंत सिन्हा जी से, जो मेरे मित्र भी है, उनसे बड़ी विनम्रता के साथ, बड़े आदर के साथ मैं अनुरोध करुंगा कि वह दिल से बताएं कि वह स्टील पैकेज के अलावा, स्टील इंडस्ट्री के अलावा और जो दूसरे रुग्ण उद्योग हैं, उनके आप, आपके वे हैं कौन?. धन्यवाद।

श्री रामदेव भंडारी (बिहार): माननीय सभापति जी, शनिवार को और आज भी श्री गुरूस्वामी द्वारा भारत सरकार के खिलाफ जो आरोप लगाए गए हैं उन पर कई माननीय सदस्यों की बहस मैंने सुनी है और माननीय सदस्यों ने बड़े विस्तार से इस संबंध में चर्चा की है और मैं पुनः इसे दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूं। महोदय, गुरूस्वामी ने जो सरकार के खिलाफ, प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ, गृह मंत्री के खिलाफ और दूसरे मंत्रियों के खिलाफ आरोप लगाए हैं, उनकी सत्यता की जांच तो एक हाई लेवल कमेटी करेगी, वह संसद् की राज्य सभा की समिति को या जे०पी०सी० हो, मगर इस बात में बिल्कुल सच्चाई है कि गुरूस्वामी द्वारा जो आरोप सरकार पर लगाए गए हैं उससे सरकार की विश्वसनीयता, उसकी साख और उसके अस्तित्व के सामने एक बड़ा प्रश्नचिन्ह खड़ा हो गया है कि प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ आरोप लगे सत्ता के दुरूपयोग का और भ्रष्टाचार का, एक गृहमंत्री के खिलाफ आरोप लगे सत्ता के दुरुपयोग का और भ्रष्टाचार का? इससे बड़ी दुर्भाग्य की बात इस देश के लिए और क्या हो सकती है? इसलिए श्रीमन, सच्चाई क्या है इस पर से पर्दा उठना चाहिए कि गुरूस्वामी ने जो आरोप लगाए हैं, उसकी सच्चाई क्या है? गुरुस्वामी कोई दूसरा आदमी नहीं, किसी आपोज़ीशन का आदमी नहीं, गुरूस्वामी इनका आदमी है। इन्होंने उनकी नियुक्ति की थी। उस महत्वपूर्ण जगह पर, वित्त मंत्री के सलाहकार के रूप में जिस किसी की नियुक्ति की जाती है या की गई है, वह कोई साधारण व्यक्ति नहीं होगा, वह किसी न किसी, या तो प्रधान मंत्री के या गृह मंत्री के या भारतीय जनता पार्टी में या सरकार में किसी न किसी बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण व्यक्ति के करीब होगा, उसी हालत में उसकी नियुक्ति हुई होगी। उनके द्वारा जो आरोप लगाया गया है उसके संबंध में यह कहा जा रहा है, हमारे सत्ता पक्ष के लोग कहते है कि एवीडेंस नहीं है, तो एवीडेंस की ही तो तलाश हो रही है। यह जो राज्य सभा में बहस हो रही है इस बहस की तरफ पूरे देश की नज़र है।

3.00 P.M.

[उपसभापति महोदया पीठासीन हुईं।]

श्री रामदेव भंडारी (क्रमागत): मैडम, गुरुस्वामी द्वारा लगाए गए आरोप अखबारों में, इलेक्ट्रिानिक मीडिया में लगातार आ रहे हैं और अब पर्लियामेंट में भी चर्चा का विषय है, तो इस देश की जनता के मन में एक संदेह पैदा हुआ है कि देश की सरकार, इस देश का प्रधान मंत्री और गृह मंत्री किस तरह से काम कर रहे हैं? इस सरकार पर सत्ता के दुरूपयोग और भ्रष्टाचार का इतना बड़ा आरोप क्यों लगा है? महोदया, मैं मानता हूं कि इस संदेह की सफाई होनी चाहिए क्योंकि इसी में इन की भी भलाई है नहीं तो यह संदेह जनता के मन में बना ही रहेगा। इसलिए इस विषय में इन को अग्नि-परीक्षा देनी ही पड़ेगी। महोदया, राम की सीता ने भी अग्नि-परीक्षा दी थी और जब यह स्वयं को राम भक्त कहते हैं तो आज इन को भी यह अग्नि-परीक्षा देनी पड़ेगी।

महोदया, इस सरकार का जन्म ही संदेह और विश्वासहीनता की स्थिति में हुआ है। इस सरकार को 17,18 और 20 पार्टियों ने मिलकर बनाया और अब ऐसा लगता है कि सभी चाहते हैं कि जो हम चाहते हैं, वही सब होना चाहिए। ये ग्रुप्स बड़े-बड़े पदों पर अपने लोगों की नियुक्तियां चाहते हैं, उन्हें गवर्नर व सलाहकार

बनाना चाहते हैं। ये पार्टियां सरकार से अधिक-से-अधिक बार्गेयनिंग करना चाहती हैं। महोदया, बिहार में राष्ट्रपति शासन यह जानते हुए भी लगाया गया कि वहां चुनी हुई बहुमत की बहुत ही मजबूत सरकार है, मगर समता पार्टी और केन्द्र सरकार के दो मंत्रियों के कहने से इन्होंने बिहार में राष्ट्रपति शासन लगाया। राष्ट्रपति जी ने इसे वापिस किया और यह जानते हुए भी कि राज्य सभा में इन का बहुमत नहीं है, फिर दूसरी बार इन्होंने राष्ट्रपति शासन लगाया और उस का यह हश्र हुआ कि इन को पुनः बिहार में राबड़ी देवी की सरकार को मजबूर होकर बहाल करना पड़ा। महोदया, यह इस सरकार की यही गति है। इस सरकार के मंत्री कैबिनेट के बाहर जाकर बयान देते हैं कि बिहार में राष्ट्रपति शासन लगाओ ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are we discussing the Finance Ministry or Bihar?

श्री रामदेव भंडारी: मैडम, जब वेंकैया नायडु जी पाकिस्तान के बारे में बोल सकते हैं, मैं तो बिहार का रहने वाला हूं और बिहार के बारे में बोल रहा हूं।

उपसभापति: पाकिस्तान के साथ कुछ इकॉनोमिक सवाल की बात रही होगी।

श्री रामदेव भंडारी: महोदया, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि सरकार के कामकाज का जो तरीका है, सरकार जिस तरह से काम कर रही है, उस में इन का आपस में कोई तालमेल नहीं है। ऐसा लगता है कि यह सरकार बिल्कुल कच्च धागे से बंधी हुई है और किसी भी समय वह धागा टूट जाएगा और सरकार बिखर जाएगी। इसलिए महोदया, मैं आप से अपील करना चाहता हूं, यह सरकार के हित में है कि इन शंकाओं की सफाई हो जाए, सरकार की अग्नि-परीक्षा हो जाए और गुरुस्वामी जी जो इन के खास आदमी रहे हैं और अभी भी हैं वैसे अब यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं, उन्होंने भी आरोप लगाए हैं, जो गंभीर आरोप लगाए हैं, मैं मांग करता हूं कि इन आरोपों की जांच के लिए एक जॉइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी का गठन हो और जॉइट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी के गठन के बाद सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री, वित्त मंत्री, इनकॉमेंशन और ब्रॉडकॉस्टिंग मिनिस्टर व गृह मंत्री खिलाफ जो आरोप लगाए गए हैं, उन की विस्तार से जांच हो और उस पर कार्यवाही हो। यही मैं आप के माध्यम से मांग करता हू। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद;।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me make an announcement as to which party's time has been consumed and which party's time is left.

The Indian National Congress has consumed its time; so has BJP. The CPI (M) has also consumed its time. For Telugu Desam, only 15 minutes; for Janata Dal — 6 minutes, SP and all these parties have got five or six minutes only. "Others" time is being taken by Mr. Jethmalani; for UPG 18 minutes are there. Sometimes we want that it should be finished in time. I know Mr. Yashwant Sinha has not had his lunch. He can go and have but as a Minister he cannot. So, I ask him to go and have his lunch. Somebody else will keep track because this is not a torture chamber. It should be a discussion Chamber; so somebody else will take down the notes. Each one of you can go and have your lunch, whatever it is, and come back. We will finish it first. I am just informing the present situation.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala): Madam Chairperson, Mr. Guruswamy, in his resignation letter as well as in certain articles, which he has written in certain papers, raised certain basic issues. Some friends, who have spoken from the BJP side, have tried to picturise the issues which he has raised as baseless. I think that the opinion expressed by or the issues expressed by Mr. Guruswamy have created a lot of suspicion among the people, in the minds of the people. And it is quite natural also, because Mr. Guruswamy belongs to the party which happens to lead the Government. He is a member of the BJP. It is on that ground that he was appointed as an Adviser to the Finance Minister. Some friends, of course, including certain Ministers have tried to say that he was not appointed as an Adviser; but in the appointment order and also in the termination letter, it was specifically stated that he was appointed as an Adviser to the Finance Minister. Therefore, to say that he was not an Adviser, is not true at all. I do not know why such gimmick has been made. Moreover, he was appointed as an Adviser to the Finance Minister to ensure proper implementation of the policies which the BJP had placed before the

people through its manifesto and later the national agenda. Even after he has resigned, or his services have been terminated, he continues to be a member of the BJP. Then what are the contentions? His criticism against the Government is that the Government is deviating from the declared policy of the BJP and also from the national agenda for governance. This is the topic. Therefore, when such a person, who belongs to the ruling party; or in whom you have reposed confidence to be appointed as an Adviser to the Finance Minister to ensure proper implementation of the policies of the ruling party and also the national agenda, comes out with certain statements, naturally people get confused. Morever, he was working in the Centre—in the nerve centre of the Government. He was a party to various governmental decisions.

And the people knew about these things. When such a person makes certain charges or criticisms, it will, normally, carry conviction with the people. The main thing which he said is a principle which needs to be looked into by the BJP and by all the parties. The main charge that he has levelled is that there is a coterie around the Prime Minister, Shri A. B. Vajpayye, headed by his adopted son-in-law. The second thing he says is that there is an inner coterie in the Cabinet, and, thirdly, he says that there is an on-going war between the prime Minister and the Home Minister and with certain other Ministers. They are not being taken into confidence. I don't want to go into the details because of lack of time. These are all happening in a democratic set up. In their National Agenda as well as in their election manifesto, what they have claimed is that they will give a good governance, an able governance and a stable Government. That was the promise that they have made. In a country like this, where a democratic set up is in force, supposing there is a coterie working over the Cabinet, and that coteries is interfering in various administrative matters, influencing very important policy decisions, — this is one allegation — if that happens, what will be the position? If that happens, naturally, there is a unconstitutional set up above the Cabinet, interfering in the real administration and influencing the decisions. It is quite alien in a democratic set up. If such things happen, then, that will lead our country to a very bad situation; it will be a danger to the democratic set-up in our country, a danger to the functioning of a democratic Government, be it of the BJP or of any other party. In the same way, inside the Cabinet also, there is a coterie. What is expected here, is a collective functioning, with mutual trust. Instead of that, what he says is, from his experience during the last 10 or 11 months, that there is an on-going war between the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. And, he says that the Prime Minister was trying to keep certain items of the Home Ministry with him, and the Home Ministry had succeeded in snatching back those things. But the Finance Minister could not snatch powers or assert himself. These are the things which he is saying. When a person like Guruswamy, who was in the Government, who was functioning along with these people, and who was participating in policy decisions, says such things, naturally, the people will believe it. And this will be very bad for a democratic set-up, for our country. Therefore, it is necessary that these matters are looked into. Another thing is that, he has cited certain instances. At the time when liberalisation and globalisation policies are being implemented, every day, we can hear people who are in the Government saying that it is highly necessary that we should bring in foreign investment, try to increase the foreign investment. And several steps are taken in this regard. Now, he has raised two points. One is relating to GE-Caps It is a subsidiary of the G.E. This G.E. has not brought any amount from the parent company; instead, they had borrowed money at a lower rate of interest, namely, at 12 per

cent, from the financial institutions in India. They have raised about Rs. 3,000 crores of rupees, and they are operating with this money. When we are eager to get foreign investments, why is a foreign company being allowed to support its subsidiary by our money? Without investing a single pie from their side, they use our money, money from our own financial institutions and banks and operate in a particular sector. How is it permissible? Why should it be done and what is the persuasion for doing so? That is one thing. Another thing that he referred to was about the second phase of the Dabhol project. There also, I do not want to go into the details. The issue that he had raised was that the Government had anyhow already taken the decision, which was a policy decision, that they shall not take more than 40% of the money required from our own banks or financial institutions in India. But in the case of Dabhol, for the second phase, more than 40 per cent was allowed to be taken, much more than what they were allowed to take. Why should they be allowed to take more? What is the reason for allowing such things? He has raised certain pertinent questions. Those questions are not being answered. When Mr. Arun Shourie was speaking the day before yesterday, he was trying to brush aside all such issues. He did not go into these questions. While talking about GE Caps issue, the major issue that he had raised was why a foreign multinational company should start a subsidiary here and that too without its own investment and, instead of that, by taking money from our own financial institutions and banks at a lower interest rate. This was the main question that he had raised. Mr. Arun Shourie had not referred to these questions. Several Members of this House had raised questions in regard to the NBCs. You see, several NBCs have sprouted up in the past. These NBCs promise high rates of interest and lure people to deposit their money and then they vanish. Of course, we had criticised it and we will criticise it even in future. But by that we don't mean that NBCs should be killed. What we say is that there should be definite terms and conditions and security against such deposits so that those who deposit their money will not lose it. And if in certain cases, the depositors lose their money, even then there should be some safeguards. So, why was this being done? This is the question that he had raised. Mr. Arun Shourie had evaded this question.

Another question that he had raised was regarding the approach towards various industries in critical sectors like, steel, cement and several other sectors, which are facing a very serious crisis. There are about 38 industrial sectors which are facing a very severe crisis at the moment. Out of that, even though the Government had come to the conclusion that these industries will be helped to revive, to activate, they haven't actually proceeded much towards that end; they have considered the case of steel industry only. There also the one step that they have taken is that they fixed a referral price. I don't know why they have arrived at that price. They had appointed a committee. An inter-Ministerial committee had been appointed and they had gone into it. Several senior Ministers were there. They had taken the decision that the referral price shall be of the order of 300 to 302 dollars per tonne. At that time the prevailing market price was only around 247 to 250 dollars per tonne. Why was such a hike made? And had that decision helped the industry to revive and to come out of the crises? The industry was not saved at all. Instead of that, certain companies could make enormous money. Madam, it is said that it is of the order of Rs. 4,000 to Rs. 5,000 crores. Unearned money could be earned by certain particular companies. Why should the Cabinet or the Cabinet Sub-Committee take such a decision in the name of finding a solution to the crisis an industry is facing? It was a decision which will lead only to helping a particular industry or industrial unit to make enormous money, unearned money

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN: Then, another question they have raised is the question of UTI's selling shares of the ITC, which it is holding, to a foreign monopoly company, like BAT. There also, there is no dispute between Mr. Guruswamy and the Finance Minister, and the other people concerned, whether those shares shall be sold to BAT or not. But, a question arises out of that. The question is, what was being thought of was to give as much shares as possible, whatever may be the price, to a foreign company, in order to take over an Indian company, or a company mainly managed by Indian officials or Indian management experts. So, such a company is being taken away by a foreign multinational. Why should the Government take such a stand? I may ask the BJP friends; — they are always talking of swadeshi. But, at the same time, why should the Government led by Shri Vajpayeeji resort to this kind of practice? It is selling one of the prestigious units of the country, like the ITC, to a foreign company. That too, without the knowledge of the people. It is a secret deal. Only when the deal takes place, then only the people will come to know about it. Madam, I don't want to take much time of the House. In this way, he has raised certain valid issues, very pertinent issues, which affect the future of the country, which are quite alien to the democratic traditions of our country, and which will endanger the democratic functioning of our country. Therefore, it is very necessary that these matters will have to be looked into in detail. Somebody said that none of us is giving proof. How can within no time. It is not at all intended for helping the industry. This is what has been done in the case of steel. They have not looked into the problesm of other industries. They have not taken any decision on those problems. Then, another question is,

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chitharanjan, you try to be brief because I have other Members also.

we, all of a sudden, give proof here? You see, these are all questions which have to be looked into in depth. Why should the BJP or the parties supporting the Government oppose it? These are all genuine issues in which all of us are interested. Therefore, my suggestion is that the whole matter should be looked into by a Joint Parliamentary Committee. It should go into all the details and find out whether there is any truth in all these allegations which have been levelled. That is what I have to say. Instead of taking a partisan attitude, let us face the situation. There is a confusion when they say that they have not committed any mistake. Will it be enough? It will not be enough. The day-before-yesterday, Shri Mahajan, all of a sudden, stood up and said that it was true that he had gone to the room of Mr. Guruswamy, and when he entered the room, he saw Mr. Mittal there, that did not mean that they have got some relationship or they had gone there together or they were raising a particular issue. That is what he said. But one thing is clear that he met the Finance Minister. Then he was advised to meet Mr. Guruswamy before he left the office. He went to Guruswamy's office. When he went there, Mr. Mittal was there. This much he admits. What I am saying is that how one can know that he had not talked about this Mittal issue. I do not say that Mr. Mahajan has committed a mistake. I do not say that But, you cannot say that you are completely safe and you are not responsible. Therefore, other people have doubts about what happened there. Therefore, this matter should be looked into. My suggestion is that a Joint Parliamentary Committee should be appointed to go into this question so that the entire country knows what the truth is. With these words, I conclude.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thirunavukkarasu. It is a very difficult name to pronounce. ...*(Interruptions)*... I have written your name in Urdu also so that I can pronounce it properly. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU (PONDICHERRY): Madam, I will give an amendment for change of my name to ARASUAS. ...*(Interruptions)*... Madam, the Pokhran explosion took place in 1998. Another explosion has been made by Mr. Guruswamy in the house of the BJP in the year 1999. We are discussing this matter today. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Naidu said, Neither Guru is with them nor is the Swamy. ...*(Interruptions)*... Now Guru and Swamy are with the opposition parties. ...*(Interruptions)*... Guru and Swamy are before the public. ..*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Earlier we have three Swamis in this House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

...*(Interruptions)*... We had Naryanasamy also....*(Interruptions)*... We had three Swamis from Tamil Nadu and from the nearby areas. ...*(Interruptions)*... Then we had Subramanian Swamy. ...*(Interruptions)*... We had Gopalsamy also. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: But, we have no Guru. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We had Mr. Gurupadaswamy. ...*(Interruptions)*... So, this House has witnessed everything. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: Madam, a great Swami visited Delhi day before yesterday. ...*(Interruptions)*... With great respect, I submit that even Sai Baba Swamy will not be able to save them. ...*(Interruptions)*... I do not want to refer to that. ...*(Interruptions)*... I leave it as it is. ...*(Interruptions)*... The House knows it. ...*(Interruptions)*... It has been pointed out that earlier Mr. Guruswamy was an IAS officer. He was a member of some other political party. In the year 1995, he joined the BJP. He was appointed as Advisor in the Finance Ministry. He joined the Finance Ministry on 31st July, 1998. According to him, he resigned on 21st January, 1999. He said, "I am a member of this party and I am working for the implementation of the agenda which has been stated in the manifesto. I was one of the original authors of the programmes. I was later asked to work on the implementation of this agenda". Hence, I was asked to assist the Finance Minister to implement the Agenda. But that gentleman has resigned, went to the press and made several charges against this Government. The main charges against the Government are a follows: Charge number one: "This Government is having a deal to sell 16 per cent of the ITTI shares, which are in the ITC, to a British-American company:" I am asking, do you plead guilty or not guilty or claims to be tried. Charge number two: "That this Government raised steel import price from US $ 247 to US $ 302, thereby giving a lot of profits to steel producers." Is it true? Do you plead guilty or not guilty or claims to be tried by the JPC?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I have started feeling like a judge over here; and before me the jury is asking.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: Madam, you are a judge. I am asking the Chair to put these questions to him. Charge number three: "Does the Government allow the Suzuki Company to control Maruti without paying for it." Do you plead guilty or not guilty or claims to be tried." Charge number four: "Does the Prime Minister's Office delay the application of the Tata Airline Project for the sake of his friend?" What do you say for this? Charge number five: "A blanket guarantee was given by the Government for the Hinduja Power Project. Is it true? May I know the reasons for the above mentioned things."

These are the charges levelled by Mohan Guruswamy against you. My submission is, it was said, "Is there any evidence, or, *prima facie* evidence, to try the charges?" I would like to say that there is a *prima facie* case against you. The following facts are materially sufficient and the circumstantial evidence that is available is itself sufficient to charge

you with a crime. One is, Mohan Guruswamy is a BJP man. He joined duty in order to implement the National Agenda of the Government. He was recommended by Advaniji. He is a responsible IAS officer. And, above all, he is an accomplice to the crime, either passive or active. An accomplice turned into an approver. An approver has made a statement before the press that these are the things that have happened. It amounts to confession, under the law. An extra-judicial confession has been made by Mohan Guruswamy in all the newspapers. So under the law, evidence of an accomplice is itself sufficient to convict any person.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: He is hostile.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: He is not hostile. He is a person. As per Section 104 of the Indian Evidence Act, the evidence of an approver or evidence of an accomplice alone is sufficient, if there is some corraboration to his evidence ...*(Interruptions)*... I am not yielding. If there is a *prima facie* case has been made out, we can charge this Government.

My next submission is, the Government has not approved the application of Tatas for setting-up of a domestic airline. Their application was pending for a period of nineteen months. Subsequently, they withdrew their application. Why was the application kept in abeyance for a period of ninteen months? The reasons are obvious. The Government has more attachment with Jet Airlines, and a coterie is working in favour of Jet Airlines. Because of that, Mr. Anantha Kumar, the Minister of Civil Aviation directed the officials to delay the application. There, it was said, that the application quota...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Madam, this is an allegation ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: Madam, these statements are being made by Guruswamy. I am just reading out the statements made by Guruswamy. It was said, "The application of Tata Airlines was delayed for the reasons whether this will create any impact on the Indian Airlines." But, at the same time, you are allowing Jet Airlines to have more flights.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has he said anywhere that the Minister asked them to be slowed down? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: Yes. Everybody is having that paper in their hands. The whole House is having that paper. The whole nation is having that paper.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Did Shri Ananth Kumar the Minister of Civil Aviation, direct the officials to delay the proposal and where is this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will put a question to the hon'ble Member that if these allegations are true, than the Minister will have to clarify because did he say that the Minister ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: By name, Ananth Kumar.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Can you read it from the paper?

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Can you read that portion? Shall I lend my paper to you? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No exchange of papers without my permission ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: madam, all I have to say is that Mohan guruswamy is a much superior person, a much higher person. He is not a petty IAS Officer; and he is saying that he was an IAS Oficer. Why should we belittle Mohan Guruswamy, who is not here? Madam, because of this, Ananth Kumar the Minister of Civil Aviation was forced to instruct his officials to delay the proposal, as was being done by the previous Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He gave instructions.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARSU: He gave instructions to the officials to dealy the files of Tatas. It is there in black and white. My learned friend can read it. then Jet Airlines was there which was allowed to fly. they are not interested in their Indian Airlines. They are not interested about India, about Indians. They are not interested only about individuals. That is the diffculty we are facing today. Then, Madam the Chairman of Suzuki wants to appoint his man in Maruti, as the Managing Director of Maruti. It was opposed by the former Industry Minister, Shri Murasoli Maran. As per the Agreement, the Managing Director of Maruti should be selected by the Government, but Suzuki appointed their man as Managing Director. The whole management of Maruti was transferred to Suzuki. Suzuki has taken full control over the production, purchase and marketing functions. The Indian Government is not getting any benefit out of it. Suzuki using the transfer pricing machanism, is siphoning off all the money to Japan. Nobody is interested in the Indian industry. Maruti is mortgaged to Suzuki. With great respect, I submit, I came to know, the Industry Minister was not really involved in this; some other persons were involved. Hindujas are supported by the Prime Minister. ESSAR group is supported by Shri L.K. Advani. Mittals are supported by Shri Pramod Mahajan and the Finance Minister. This Government is run by the Industrialists. This government is defending all the industrialists. This Government is running for the power and for money. My friend, Duraisamy, used to say that every Monday, in Karol Bagh, a bazar is opened. Here bazars are being opened by this Government in North and South Block. Commission agents, brokers are roaming in the corridors of the two Blocks, bargaining to give everything. At any moment of time, India will be mortgaged.

I know a little bit about the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act. In that, there is a provision for an adopted son and for an adopted daughter, but there is nothing about an adopted son-in-law. An adopted son-in-law is taking care of ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Actually, no son-in-law belongs to this House. So, let us not say so. I think it is not fair.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: We have discussed about the law. I am not making an allegation. I am only talking about laws.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is not fair. We should not take the names of those people who are not here to defend themselves.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: I am talking about sons-in-law. I am not talking about an individual son-in-law. I am not blaming them.

As far as sons are concerned, sons have a right in the property of their father. Daughters also have a right in the property of their father. As far as sons-in-law are concerned, whatever they lay their hands on, is their property.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, no. I don't accept it. You are somebody's son-in-law.

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आजमी (बिहार): प्रधानमंत्री की शादी तो हुई नहीं, दामाद कहां से आएगा?

†[مولانا عبید اللہ خاں اعظمی: پردھان منتری کی شادی تو ہوئی نہیں۔ داماد کہاں سے آئیگا۔]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't want this kind of a talk. No, please. I tell you one thing. Let us make no allegations on relations like saying that sons-in-law are taking something. Are you not a son-in-law of somebody?

....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI C.P. THURUNAVUKKARASU: I don't have any son-in-law.

....(*Interruptions*)

†[ ]Transilteration in Arabic Script

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you married or not?

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARSAU: I am married.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are somebody's son-in-law,

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: I have got four daughters-in-law. ....(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't do it.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: As far as this hand is concerned, I think, this hand is being prevented. This hand will be prevented somehow or the other.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: We are talking of in-laws, not outlaws.

उपसभापति: हिन्दी में ट्रांसलेशन करेंगे तो इसका मतलब होगा, कानून का बेटा, सन-इन-ला। इसलिए कानून की बात बीच में नहीं लाइए।

Talk about the issue present before us, not about relations.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: I am winding up.

The allegations are of a serious nature. Grave allegations have been made in House. The whole public is watching us. The majority of the Members of this House demand a probe into this matter. A Joint Parliamentary Committee alone will solve the problem at present.

My submission is this. You are all along saying, "We are innocent. We have nothing to do with the matter. This is mud-slinging on us." I am asking one question: "Have you at least issued a notice to Mohan Guruswamy? Have you served at least a lawyer's notice on him?" You have said, "it caused us great humiliation. It is great damage to us." Then, you are entitled to file a criminal complaint under section 107 Cr. PC before the criminal court. Why have you not done it so far? If you have guts, do it. Prosecute him before the court of law. You will not be able to do it becuase you will tarnish yourselves before the court of law. That is why you are not willing to go there.

So, I want to say that a Joint Parliamentary Committee should be appointed to go into all the details of this matter. I submit this with great respect.

Thank you very much.

उपसभापति: श्री मार्गबन्धु। मार्गबन्धु का मतलब होता है, फ्रेंड आन दि रोड।

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (TAMIL NADU) Madam Deputy Chairman, we have been hearing the prosecution case. In criminal jurisprudence, if a case has to go to a court, there should some material or there should be a prima facie case. then alone can a case be taken on the file and a further trial held.

Now, from the arguments put forth by the other side, including the Leader of the Opposition, you will find, when they were asked to own the responsibility, they did not own it. What the Leader of the Opposition said was: "I am simply relying upon the statement given by Mr. Guruswamy. Beyond that I do not go." That is the stand taken by almost all the speakers on the other side. Sir, they do not want to own the responsibility, but they want to rely upon the statement. Sir, if you thorugh the entire statment, you will see that the other side was not courageous enough to say that there was an act of corruption. The only relied upon conjectures and surmises. They think that this could have been. They feel that in such a case so much amount could have gone into somebody's pocket. But, they were not able to say by which act so much of corruption has taken place and by which particular Minister. They were not able to pinpoint any particular person. They made a general statement, without substantiating the allegation. If the allegations are not substantiated on material and particulars, the case will not be taken up on file for trial.

Sir, another point is whether a JPC is necessary. They have been quoting several instances. Yes, several instances can be

discussed in an appropriate forum, but this is not the forum to discuss the letter written by an expelled Government servant, after he quit his office. After quitting his office that person levels allegations, which are not substantiated. I would like to know whether the House should waste its precious time on unsubstantiated alleglations made by that gentleman. When there is no allegations against any person of the ruling Government, this type of discussion would lead to nothing, except mudslinging. Nothing would come out of it. There may several demands on the subject, but the time of the House should not be wasted like this. If he claims to be a Government servant, so long he is in service, he is bound by certain Government codes of conduct and ethics. Sir, as a lawyer, who get a brief from his client, is expected not to divulge the secret, the Government servant also, who is in possession of an information, is not expected to divulge it. So, my respectful submission is that some code of conduct has to be framed for taking action against such persons. Sometimes, they may be from this Government, and some other time, they may be from your Government, when you come to power. So, that practice of explaining a thing which he acquired while in office has to be curbed. Steps should be taken for evolving certain codes of conduct. My respectful submission is, on every action of the Government, motives are attributed. When projects are granted, you say they might have even received certain gratifications. When the Tata Airlines was not granted permission to operate, even then, there were allegations. If it is done, there is an allegations; if it is not done, there is an allegation. I would like to ask whether this approach should be acceptable or not. I leave it for the consideration of the House. Spending time on this will merely be a waste of time. Nothing will come out of it, except mud-slinging on one another. With these words, I conclude.

उपसभापतिः श्री मुकेश आर० पटेल।

श्री एम० वेंकैया नायडुः इनकी मेडेन स्पीच है। **(व्यवधान)** Madam is in the Chair.

उपसभापतिः मेडेन स्पीच तो है। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि आप यह कहें कि घंटी न बजाएं। आप बता दीजिये कि कितनी देर आप बोलेंगे। You can take ten minutes. During these ten minutes, I will not ring the bell. .. ....*(Interruptions)*... Please don't disturb him.

श्री मुकेश, आर, पटेल (महाराष्ट्र): मैडम, मोहन गुरुस्वामी के इंटरव्यू और पेपर स्टेटमेंट के ऊपर काफी लोग बोल चुके हैं, काफी मेम्बर बोल चुके हैं मैं उनको फिर से रिपीट नहीं करुंगा, जो मेरे को उसमें कुछ बोलना है पर वह बाद में बोल दूंगा। एक अहम इश्यू पर मुझे बोलना है। मैं उस पार्टी से हूं जो गवर्नमेंट की सपोर्टिंग पार्टी है। फिर भी कुछ ऐसी चीजें हैं जो नेशनल इंटरसेट के अंदर हैं। तो मेरा बोलना जरूरी है इसलिए मैं बोल रहा हूं। मैं जो एलीगेशन करना चाहता हूं, डायरेक्टली प्राइम मिनिस्टर को करना चाहता हूं। सारे प्रुफ्स मेरे पास हैं और उसके बाद बोल रहा हूं। मोहन गुरुस्वामी के लेटर में एक जगह सपेसिफिक मेन्शन है ..**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkaiah Naidu, do you still feel that nobody should disturb him?

श्री मुकेश आर० पटेलः सारे प्रुफ्स हैं मेरे पास उसके बाद बोल रहा हूं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर के बारे में मोहन गुरुस्वामी ने काफी चीजें कहीं। पर एक पर्टिकुलर जगह उसने यह कहा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जब रिलायंस पर रेड हो रहा था तब उसको रोकने की कोशिश की थी और आडवाणी जी ने उसको सकसेस नहीं होने दिया और वह रेड हुई। रेड हुई उसके बाद जो उसमें सेसिफिक दबा दिया गया उसमें मैं आपको कुछ ऐसी चीज बताउंगा क्योंकि जो रेड हुई थी उसमें बेसिकली मेरा एक मुद्दा था जिसकी वजह से रेड हुई। इसका मुद्दा था — एक रोमेश शर्मा केस था, दूसरा एक पैट्रोलियम एडल्ट्रेशन का केस था, देश में 50-60 हजार करोड़ का एक स्कैंडल था जिसमें रिलायंस इन्वाल्व था। मैंने 9 अक्टूबर को, मच बिफोर यह जो रेड हुई थी या रोमेश शर्मा जो कांड हुआ उसके पहले प्राइम मिनस्टिर को एक लेटर लिखा जिसकी कापी मेरे पास है, जो चाहें पढ़ सकते हैं। इन कापी का उन्होंने मेरे को एकनालेजमेंट दिया कि मुझे मिल गया है। बस दैट्स आल। एक इतना सीरियस इश्यू था जिसके ऊपर मैंने तीन पेज का लेटर लिखकर उनको सारे प्रुफ्स बताए थे, और यहां तक कहा था मैंने कि मेरे को आप टाइम दे दें। अक्टूबर से6 महीने हो गए, मुझे उन्होंने टाइम नहीं दिया। 9

तारीख को लेटर लिखने के बाद मैंने 12 तारीख की स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में — मैं पैट्रोलियम कमेटी में हूं — यह मुद्दा फिर से उठाया गया कि एडल्ट्रेशन एक ऐसी चीज है जो देश को दीमक की तरह खा रही है। यह एडल्ट्रेशन आज पहली बार हो रहा है ऐसी बात नहीं है। वर्षों से चला आ रहा है। अंग्रेजों के टाइम से एडल्ट्रेशन होता था। पर एडल्ट्रेशन छोट-छोटी एजेंसियां, पम्प वाले या और जो भी करते थे, वह छोट-मोटे पैमाने पर होता था। फर्स्ट टाईम यह देखा जा रहा है पिछले 5-7 -10 साल से, मोर स्पेसिफिकली 1990 से कि रिलायंस डायरेक्टली एक ऐसा बिजिनेस हाउस है जो डायरेक्टली एडल्ट्रेशन में इन्वाल्व है। उसके एडल्ट्रेशन में होने की वजह यह है कि उनके पास एक नाफ्था का कोटा है। तीन लाख टन पर इयर का जो नाफ्था का कोटा है उसका वे मिसयूज कर रहे हैं और मिसयूज करके पंप वालों को बेच रहे हैं। इसके प्रूफ्स सारे उसके अन्दर लिखकर स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में कहा। स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में वहां पर ज्यवांयट सेक्रेटरी थे मिस्टर निर्मल सिंह। निर्मल सिंह ने कहा कि येस यह हमारे पास कंप्लेंट आई थी। हमने इंक्वायरी की और इंक्वायरी करने के बाद मालूम पड़ा कि रिलायंस इसका मिसयूज कर रहा है —नाफ्था के कोटे का जो नाफ्था 7 रुपए लिटर का है वह 27 रुपए लिटर के पैट्रोल में मिक्स हो रहा है। यह निर्मल सिंह ने जब कहा तो उसके 15 दिन के बाद से निर्मल सिंह के पास से चार्ज ले लिया गया। इसके बाद मैंने जब देखा कि गर्वनमेंट की तरफ से कुछ नहीं हो रहा है तो मैंने पैट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर राममूर्ति जी को लेटर लिखा। यह अपने संतोष गंगवार जी बैठे हैं। इनको भी लैटर लिखा। इन्होंने मुझे बम्बई फोन किया था और कहा कि आप उधर-उधर सब जगह पेपर स्टेटमेंट कर रहे हो, बैटर है कि मुझे चिट्ठी लिख दो मैं एक्शन लूंगा। आज तक उन्होंने कोई भी एक्शन नहीं लिया। मैंने उनके पास चिट्ठी भेजी और डिटेल्स दी थी। इनसे एप्वाइंटमेंट मांगा। राममूर्ति जी से एप्वाइंटमेंट मांगा, प्राइम मिनिस्टर से एप्वाइंटमेंट मांगा। एक ही आदमी ने उसमें एक्शन लिया—वे हैं आडवाणी जी जो उसको रेड तक ले गए। आफ्टर 5—10 डेज वेट करने के बाद मैंने जी०टी०वी० पर इंटरव्यू दिया जिसको जी०टी०वी० ने नाम दिया "न्यूज ब्रेक"। उसमें मैडम सारी चीजें मैंने टी०वी० के ऊपर बतायीं कि किस तरह एडल्ट्रेशन हो रहा है, क्या-क्या हो रहा है, किस पैमाने पर हो रहा है, कैसे उनको नाफ्था का कोटा दिया गया — 10, 12 साल से। वित्त मंत्री जी जानते हैं। 12 साल से नाफ्था के भाव में कोई चेंज नहीं हुआ, जस्ट बिकाज 7 रुपए का नाफ्था 27 रुपए में बेचा जाए। इसलिए नाफ्था के भाव में चेंज नहीं हुआ —इवन इस बजट में भी। वित्त मंत्री जी ने एक रुपया डीजल पर लगा दिया। जो किसान वहां पर उसमें था उस डीजल पर उन्होंने एक रुपया टैक्स लगा दिया मगर नाफ्था को टच नहीं किया क्योंकि देश का 60 से 90 परसेंट नाफ्था रिलायंस ले लेता है। रिलायंस को जो नाफ्था दिया जाता है वह बेसिकली उनको जाइलीन बनाने के लिए दिया जाता है। वे 20 टका यूज करते थे और 80 परसेंट रिटर्न देते थे। वह 80 परसेंट जो पहले रिटर्न हो जाता था, यह 1990-92 तक ही हुआ। लेकिन 1992 से 99 तक एक ड्राप भी उन्होंने वापस नहीं दिया और साग माल पैट्रोल में एडल्ट्रेशन में जा रहा है। फिर भी जब कुछ नहीं हुआ, फिर उसके 8 दिन के बाद जी०टी०वी० पर मैंने रिकार्ड पर रिलायंस से गाड़ी निकल रही है, टैकर निकल रहा है, नम्बर, उस गाड़ी के वाउचर, ड्राइवर का स्टेटमेंट, पम्प तक जाते और खाली होने तक की सारी चीजें बतायीं। फिर भी इन लोगों ने, किसी ने —पैट्रोलियम मंत्रालय या प्राइम मिनिस्टर मंत्रालय ने, किसी ने मेरे को कुछ बोला नहीं। आराम से बैठे रहे।

उसी बीच रोमेश शर्मा के यहां रेड हुई। मैंने अपने उस एलीगेशन में कहा था बाला सुब्रह्मण्यम पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर से इन्वाल्व है। ये इनके उनके साथ नैकसेस हैं पेट्रोलियम आफिसर और पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्टरी में। जो चाहता है बाला सुब्रह्मण्य, वही स्टेटमेंट होते हैं, वही आगे पालिसी बनती है। उसका मैंने कहा था कि बाला सुब्रह्मण्यम, के रेड होनी चाहिए पर तब उन्होंने नहीं की। रोमेश शर्मा के यहां जब रेड हुई उसके बाद बाला सुब्रह्मण्यम के यहां जो डाकूमेंट्स मिले, ये दोनों वजह थीं जो सी०बी०आई० की रेड हुई। सी०बी०आई० की रेड होने के बाद मुझे लगा कि कि कुछ होगा। मगर हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि सी०बी०आई० की जब कोई रेड होती है, जब कोई इन्क्वायरी हो तो दस-दस बीस-बीस साल तक कोई जवाब नहीं आते हैं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर को इतनी कोई जल्दी नहीं थी क्योंकि मेरा शक इसलिए ज्यादा पक्का होता जा रहा है कि एग्जैक्टली आफ्टर 48 आवर्ज़ उन्होंने लखनऊ में किसी फंक्शन में कहा कि रिलायंस को क्लीन चिट दी गई। इन्होंने कभी एडल्ट्रेशन नहीं किया। जिसका कोई रीज़न नहीं था। एक जब सी०बी०आई० ने रेड की है उसकी कम से कम रिपोर्ट आनी थी। उसकी रिपोर्ट यदि आती तो मालूम पड़ता कि क्या हुआ। उसके पहले उन्होंने स्टेटमेंट कर दिया। स्टेटमेंट करने के कुछ ही दिन बाद, दस दिन बाद यह मिश्रा जो डाइरेक्टर थे, उसमें जो एक्टिंग डाइरेक्टर थे,

उनको उन्होंने हटा दिया और ओ०एस०डी० पी०एम०ओ० बना दिया। जबकि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जजमेंट है ....**(व्यवधान)** वहां से हटा दिया और पी०एम०ओ० में ओ०एस०डी०, में बना दिया। ....**(व्यवधान)** त्रिनाथ मिश्रा। त्रिनाथ मिश्रा को पी०एम०ओ० में ओ०एस०डी० बना दिया। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने सी०वी०सी० बैठाई है। इसलिए सी०वी०सी० बनाई है कि सी०वी०सी० का जो रेकमेंडेशन है वह गवर्नमेंट को मानना चाहिए। सी०वी०सी० का रेकमेंडेशन टॉप ऑफ् द लिस्ट था फिर भी उसको हटाया। अभी कुछ दिन पहले उसको ओ०एस०डी० से भी निकाल दिया, सी०आर०पी०एफ० का डी०जी० बना दिया ताकि पूरे सिस्टम से वह त्रिनाथ मिश्रा बाहर निकल जाएं। ....**(व्यवधान)**

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: रिलायंस को छोड़ बाकी सब को सस्पेंड कर दिया।

श्री मुकेश आर० पटेल: रिलायंस को छोड़ कर बाकी सब को सस्पेंड कर दिया। अभी ये जो इसके पेपर्ज़ हैं, सारे फिगर्ज हैं, मेरे पास एक्च्युली ये सारे प्रूफस हैं, इन्क्लूडिंग सारी टेपस्, हर चीज़ मेरे पास आज है, जब भी वह चाहिए प्राइम मिनिस्टर को दे सकता हूं और संतोष कुमार गंगवार जी को भी दे सकता हूं, क्योंकि फोन पर बोला था। पर टिल टुडे उन्होंने आज तक मुझे कभी बुलाया नहीं, कभी मेरे से मांगा नहीं।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: कौन हटा दिया?

श्री मुकेश आर० पटेल: प्राइम मिनिस्टर। ये सारी चीज़े यह बताती हैं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर किस तरह से रिलायंस को फेवर करना चाहते हैं। किस तरह से जब क्लीयरली एक आदमी, एक मैंबर जब 6-6 महीने से टाइम मांग रहा हो, अक्तूबर से मैं उनको तीन चिट्ठी लिख चुका हूं कि अब मुझे समय दे दो, मेरे पास प्रूफ है। लेकिन टिल टुडे न आज तक उन्होंने मुझे कोई फोन किया और न कुछ किया, सिर्फ एक एकनॉलेज भेज दिया कि मेरे को मिला है, बस। उसके बाद मैंने पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्ट्री में काफी चिट्ठियां लिखीं। पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर ने रेड की और रेड करने के बाद उन्होंने 200 पंप सस्पेंड किए। 320 पंप पर रेड की और 200 पंप पर नाप्था मिला। उससे प्रूव हुआ, मैंने जो बोला वह सारा सही हुआ। उसके बावजूद वह जो पंप वाले थे उनके 200 पंप को सस्पेंड कर दिया, पर जो नाप्था जहां से आया था रिलायंस से उसके ऊपर आज तक कोई एक्शन नहीं हुआ। ....**(व्यवधान)**.....

....**(व्यवधान)** 6-6 बार मैं स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में जाकर बोला हूं कि मेरे पास है और आफिसर्ज़ जो इन्वॉलव हैं उनके बारे में भी बोला हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)**

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री संतोष कुमार गंगवार): मैंने उसी दिन कहा था कि आकर मिल सकते हैं। ....**(व्यवधान)**

श्री मुकेश आर० पटेल: नहीं। मेरा खत है आपके पास। यह रिकार्ड दिया है जिसमें आपका एकनॉलेजमेंट है। ....**(व्यवधान)**

श्री संतोष कुमार गंगवार: आप शाम को मेरे पास आ जाएं। ....**(व्यवधान)**

श्री मुकेश आर० पटेल: नहीं, अब क्यों? ....**(व्यवधान)** अब तो जे०पी०सी० को दीजिए क्योंकि यह इतना अहम मुद्दा है, जहां कि इतना बड़ा बिज़नेस है उसमें डाइरेक्टली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन तक इन्वाल्व है। उसके वहां सी०बी०आई० रेड हुई और सी०बी०आई० रेड को दबाया जा रहा है। इसको जे०पी०सी० में....**(व्यवधान)** मेरा इतना ही कहना है कि जब भी जे०पी०सी० एप्वांयट हो तो उसके बाद उसके टर्म्स ऑफ् रेफ्रेंस में इसको जरूर डाला जाए। दैट्स आल। धन्यवाद।

SHRI MD. SALIM: Madam, even a Member of the ruling Party's ally, demands a JPC. *(Interruptions)*. Madam, one of the Members belonging to the alliance partner, Shiv Sena, is demanding a JPC *...(Interruptions). He is showing the papers he is having to prove how the PMO is favouring the Reliance Group. (Interruptions)*.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, the Government will have to either come out with proof to refute what he has said or agree for a JPC. *(Interruptions)*

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: क्या बोलते हैं ....**(व्यवधान)**....

श्री मुकेश आर० पटेल: मैंने जो कुछ भी कहा उसका प्रूफ मेरे पास है। ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: महोदया... **(व्यवधान)** एक्टिंग डाइरेक्टर को हटाया गया। वह भी इसलिए कि रिलायंस के अगेन्स्ट में उसके पास पेपर्ज़ आए। रेड किया गया। मैडम, मैं जब शनिवार को बोल रहा था तो मैंने यही कहा था कि रिलायंस के यहां सी०बी०आई० के द्वारा रेड किया गया और आज रूलिंग पार्टी के मैंबर्स

कह रहे हैं कि रिलायंस के एक्टिंग डायरेक्टर को हटाया गया।

†[شری محمد سلیم: مہودیہ ..."مداخلت"..
ایکٹنگ ڈائریکٹر کو ہٹایا گیا۔ وہ بھی اس
لئے کہ ریلائنس کے ایجنٹ میں اسکے
پاس پیسہ آئے۔ ریڈ کیا گیا۔ میڈم میں جب
شنیوار کو بول رہا تھا تو میں نے یہی کہا تھا
کہ ریلائنس کے یہاں سی بی آئی کے
ذریعہ ریڈ کیا گیا اور آج دو لنگ پارٹی
کے ممبرس کہہ رہے ہیں کہ ریلائنس
کے ایکٹنگ ڈائریکٹر کو ہٹایا گیا۔]

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: Madam Deputy Chairman, my colleagues on the Left have been continuously saying that they have no charges of corruption. Madam, I would refer to them the charge of crony capitalism, and I would urge them to study their own manifesto and what the manifesto has to say about the crony capitalism. I am going to read it out. It says: "We oppose the crony capitalism that both came about as a result of the collusion between the politicians, bureaucrats and businessmen. We oppose the corruption that inevitably became a part of the system that was created. We continuously oppose the Congress party that was both the creator and then the creature of this corrupt system." Now, their own man, Mr. Mohan Guruswamy, and the writer of the manifesto because I am going to make...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Self-proclaimed?

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: No, not as self-procalimed. No one has denied it till now, and since it has been questioned, I shall read out what he has to say about his apppointment. He says: "I am a, member of the party and worked on developing the party's agenda which has been spelt out in the manifesto. Since I was one of the original authors of the programme, the leader said that I should get involved in its implementation." Now, Sir, this is a very serious charge, and I think, the hon. Finance Minister, is the only one who could understand the depth of this charge and the width of this charge because he has reacted and said: "If any charge is proved, I would resign." yet the defenders like my friend, Ram Jethmalani and Mr. Arun Shourie. kept saying that there was no charge of corruption. I don't think it could be clearer. When you look at the crony capitalism and look at the definition of crony capitalism, as spelt out in the manifesto, on the basis of which your party was elected, crony capitalism existed in many parts of the world--Indonesia, Iran, Philippines and Zaire, we have seen the result where these countries have finally gone, and what has been the result and what charges have been faced by the people who perpetuated the crony capitalism? It is very clear and I don't think it needs further clarification. Therefore, my submission is that before we reach that stage, jointly, we must study in depth, investigate in depth the charges that have been levelled by Mr. Guruswamy, come to a conclusion, put correctives in place, and if there are any guilty persons, they must be punished. It is no one's case that this person is corrupt or that person is corrupt. But a very important issue has been raised and that issue will not face away or it cannot be put under the carpet. It has to be thoroughly investigated and the only place where this investigation by a Parliamentary Committee can take place is the JPC. There are certain issues and I do not want to repeat what my colleagues have already stated in the House. But there are certain issues which need clarifications. The hon. Member, Shri

†[ ]Transilteration in Arabic Script

Arun Shourie, tried to demolish the credibility of Mr. Guruswamy. I just like to put the record straight. I know Mr. Guruswamy since the early seventies. At that time, he was working in a large company of which I was the Chairman for many years, and therefore, I had known a little more about him as youngman. He was very intelligent, very committed and a man of high integrity. That was Mr. Guruswamy as I knew him in the seventies. After that, he went to Harward. Then he was associated with the two former Prime Ministers, who had nothing but good things to say about him. He was also a close friend of the hon. Finance Minister, with whom he was a first name basis, and therefore, apart from being with the B.J.P. for the past five years, he was a member of their think tank, and they thought it fit for him to be appointed to a senior position in the Finance Ministry. ....which, I believe, was the second most important position as far as the hierarchy was concerned. And what he has to say is not just the question of squaring as some poeple have tried to make it to be. These are the submissions of a man who is in pain, who is anguished, because of the negative impact of all that has been happening, on the economy, on the very credibility of our nation, on the political stability of our country because thinking people know what has overtaken the nations which practised crony-capitalism. We have seen these Governments being thrown out, we have seen those dictators or those perpetuators of this crony-capitalism being run out of their countries and prosecuted. And we have seen those countries come to naught; despite being very rich countries, they have been impoverished because of what has been happening in those countries. Sir, I don't want to go into the depth of these issues because they have been clearly raised by some speakers, but there are still some which, I think, require clarification.

Mr. Arun Shourie, again referred to an article appeared in the "Asian Age", wherein the names of same hon. Members have been mentioned. Mr. Kapil Sibal had raised the previlege issue. I think he will, perhaps, recollect that I had also raised the same issue in this House and I had mentioned that the list of politicians, bureaucrats and policemen was in circulation. In fact, I gave this list to some hon. Colleagues of mine much before it was published. The hon. Home Minister was there at that time, and my suggestion was that those officials and those bureaucrats who were in sensitive positions and who had been so named should, for the time being, at least be given non-sensitive jobs so that the entire security of the country was not jeopardised. I had written many letters to the Home Minister. I had written to the Prime Miunister, I had written to many members of Parliament. Unfortunately, my very motivated colleague has just spoken about the events that have taken place in the Petroleum Ministry. A similar thing is happening here. Because of the link of powerful groups who are involved in all this, no action has been taken. In fact, those very people who have been charged or who are under suspicion have been totally exonerated. That is very unfortunate because I don't think the internal security of a country can be played around with such impunity. We are becoming a soft State. and I think this one act alone proves that we are a very soft State.

Madam, the issue raised on the Hinduja National Power Company is important. Apart from the issues that have been raised regarding guarantees and counter-guarantees, a much larger issue, I think, should be addressed, and that is, from 1992 till now, the cost of hardwares constitutes at least 60 per cent of the cost of a power project and that is now selling, at a discount internationally at 40 or 50 per cent, in some cases even at 60 per cent. Therefore, the cost of such power projects all over the country should come down by 30 per cent. We know that in the Ninth Five Year Plan, we are proposing to put up 45,000 megawatts which means an investment of

over Rs. 1,80,000 crores. If that be so,—and these power projects are overvalued by 30 per cent—we are talking of a possible loss, in foreign exchange, to our country of the order of Rs. 60,000 crores. This power project was initiated in 1992. It has taken six or seven years. My question to the hon. Minister is this. Did anyone look at the cost of this particular power plant before giving this guarantee or clearnance? Because if they did not do it, then I think they have done India a great harm. We would lose 30 per cent unnecessarily in over-valuing the cost of that product.

Madam, the second issue is on Suzuki and BATITC. It has also been mentioned by my hon. colleague. As we all know, when you evaluate—apart from other parmeters—the price of a plant, of a company, the first thing you consider is its profitability. The second thing is the managerial control that you have. And the third is the future prospects. In the case of Suzuki, we parted with one key component, 'control' for no consideration. And yet, I had raised this issue in the House when I said I think the purport was lost on the hon. Minister of industry when I said that you have already helped your party by giving control; now, please help the country by selling the entire share capital of this company for which you will probably get Rs. 6000 to Rs. 7000 crores of rupees. Because if you don't do it now, one year down the line, since you have already given away the control, free, you probably will get half that amount. What will you tell the nation, that we got *sine cure* for five to six bureaucrats during this period? That is all you will tell the nation. And this is what is going to happen. The price that you will get now will be lower than when we had control. It is anyone's guess, as to why we gave this control for nothing. The same issue was raised by Mr...*(interruptions)*... well, they have to explain because I said, that is one component of the price of the whole Suzuki company. And if you have given it away free, then someone must explain why we gave it free. *(interruptions)*...

On the issue of steel, the hon. Minister may kindly wait for a minute because I will just talk about steel, if it is of any interest to him.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI NAVEEN PATNAIK): I will be right back.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: I have been raising this issue of dumping and it is a fact that our anti-dumping mechanism is weak. we have been continuously promised by the hon. Minister for Commerce that this is being strengthened. But what is happening? I know of some cases where, after a thorough study, they recommended for 'x' duty being imposed. Well, instead of imposing that 'x' duty, they have counter-lobbies working and then they go and reduce that duty by 50 per cent. This has happened. But this is the first case in steel where all this anti-dumping mechanism is there. And the inter-ministerial group recommended a referral price of Rs. 247/- and, suddenly, a floor price of Rs. 302/- was imposed. Why? And the hon. Urban Development Minister came up with some new definition of dumping when he said that the London metal Exchange rates were 'x', Dumping is not related to the rates that exist in the London Metal Exchange. It is basically whe States sell a product below the fair market price in their country. This is the simple definition.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I did not use the word 'dumping'.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: You used that for justifying the higher protection that was given. I am sorry; I agree that you don't have experience in this. But, at the same time, it is the first instance where, overriding the recommendation of the body that had been set up for determining what protection should be given, this kind of a floor price has been instituted. Now, I would like to talk

about GE-Caps. This is my last issue. The other issues have already been raised, here again I would like to refer to what you call the Election Manifesto of the BJP. They got elected on the basis of this manifesto. So, I must remind them about it. what they had to say about the NBFCs when they went with this manifesto? I quote—

> "The BJP realises that savings, banking and finance is in the Indian blood. There are tens of thousands of private financial institutions, nidhis, cheques and other native methods of augmenting finance and also modern-day Non-Banking Financial Institutions. The BJP views this sector a potentially very important one. The policy on NBFCs has been *ad hoc* and they have been dealth with at times in a reckless manner."

Now what does the present Government do? What is GE-Caps? It is a subsidiary of the mighty General Electric of the USA. It comes here, opens shops and gets a letter of comfort. My hon. friends know what a "letter of comfort" is. All that it says is, "Whomsover it may concern. This is to confirm that GE-Caps is our subsidiary". That is all what it says. On the strength of that the indian FIs lend money to GE-Caps at 12 per cent. This is my information. I stand to be corrected. More than three thousand crores of rupees have been lent to GE-Caps who in turn have used this money to completely sabotage the indian NBFCs by lending at 17 per cent, 18 per cent and $18^1/_2$ per cent because the Indian NBFCs take deposits from people like you and me at 16 per cent. Therefore, they are not in a position to lend under 19 per cent. Shri Arun Shourie is right when he says that some of the companies have cheated the people. Haven't stockbrokers done it in the scames? Haven't the industrialists done it? Haven't the politicians done it? Haven't the bureaucrats done it? There are scamsters everywhere. Hundreds of thousands of NBFCs exist throughout the country, you have spoken about them in your manifesto. What I am trying to say is this. These are very serious issues and these issues must be addressed. You can't put them under the carpet and hope that there is nothing wrong and everyone will accept it. I would just like to bring to your notice that the whole country is talking about it. This is a subject of discussion in almost every household in Delhi as it is in other parts of India. The Parliament must seriously look into this issue and, through a Joint Parliamentary Committee, study it, come to a conclusion and let the nation know where we are standing on this issue of crony capitalism.

उपसभापति: आज़मी साहब, 6 मिनट हैं आपकी पार्टी के। आप 6 मिनट ही बोलिएगा।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: मैडम, टेल ऐंडर्स बैट्समैन भी छक्का मार सकते हैं।

†[جناب محمد سلیم: میڈم - ٹیل اینڈرس بیٹس مین چھکا مار سکتے ہیں۔]

उपसभापति: छक्का मारें या चौका मारें, 6 मिनट ही इनके पास हैं।

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी: मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिबा, छक्के-चौके का सवाल नहीं है, सवाल है मुल्क में गरीबों के बकार और गरीबों के हितों के तहफ्फुज का जो चन्द मुट्ठी भर लोगों के हाथों में आज सिमट कर रह गया है। मैडम, हमारे सारे साथियों ने इस गंभीर मसले पर जिस तरह तफसील के साथ बातें की हैं उसकी रोशनी में अब कुछ बातें कहने को नहीं रह गई हैं। मैं सिर्फ इतनी बात कह कर अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा।

श्री अन्तराय देवशंकर दवे: कुछ भी नहीं मिला...(**व्यवधान**)

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी: नहीं, मामला यह है कि—

> "दिल के फफूले जल गये सीने के दाग से,
> इस घर को आग लग गई घर के चिराग से।"

†[ ]Transilteration in Arabic Script

इसलिये बहुत गंभीर है यह। अगर सिर्फ इधर से आरोप होता तो आप यह कह कर गुजर सकते थे कि मसला गंभीर नहीं है। मगर जब हमारे कुलिग मि० मुकेश पटेल साहब की तरफ से भी यह मसला नहले पर दहला बन कर आ गया है सामने। इसके बावजूद अगर आप यह कहें कि यह मामला गंभीर नहीं है तो आप लोग देश के साथ गंभीर नहीं हैं और देश की समस्याओं के साथ गंभीर नहीं हैं। मैं अर्ज करना चाहूंगा कि हमारे जो भाई इस मुल्क के वजीरे खजाना और बहुत ही बुद्धिमान लीडर जनाब यशवन्त सिन्हा साहब जिनका मेरे दिल में बेहद ऐतराम है, मैं उनकी तकलीफ को खूब जानता हूं, उनकी परेशानी को पहचानता हूं, बहुत इस्सास आदमी हैं। मैं यह जानता हूं कि:—

"छुपाए बैठे हैं सीने में एक शिकस्त का राज,
तमाम शहर में फैला है जो खबर की तरह।"

यह मामूली मसला नहीं बहुत गंभीर मसला है। मसला यह है—भाई, कि आप लोगों ने एक छपा हुआ एजेंडा दिया था जिसको हमारे कुलिग आभी पढ़ रहे थे। आप भयमुक्त सरकार देने की बात कर रहे हैं, आप करप्शन से अलग-थलग सरकार देने की बात कर रहे हैं और—

"इस सादगी पर कौन न मर जाए ए खुदा,
लड़ते हैं मगर हाथ में तलवार तक नहीं।"

भयमुक्त सरकार देने की बात आपने अपने एजेंडे में की है, करप्शन से मुक्त सरकार देने की बात आपने अपने एजेंडे में की है। हमें तो क्या मालूम था कि एक छपा हुआ एजेंडा है और एक छिपा हुआ एजेंडा है आपके पास। छपा हुआ एजेंडा तो पढ़ दिया हमारे एक साथी ने...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल: आपको क्या पता है...(**व्यवधान**)

मौलाना औबेदुल्ला खान आज़मी: पता है कि आज आपका जन्म दिन है, आपको जन्म दिन मुबारक और पार्लियामेंट में...(**व्यवधान**) तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था मैडम्, एक हमारे कुलिग ने बी० जे० पी० का छपा हुआ एजेंडा पढ़ा। तो आपने जो अपनी बात कही थी इसलिए कही थी कि देश ने आप पर विश्वास करके आपको वोट दिया। मगर विश्वासघात करने का आपको कोई हक नहीं पहुंचता देश के साथ और वोटरों के साथ। देश की सम्पत्ति के साथ आपको विश्वासघात करने का कोई हक नहीं पहुंचता। छपे हुए एजेंडे में आप कहते हैं कि भयमुक्त सरकार देंगे। छपे हुए एजेंडे में आप कहते है कि करप्शनमुक्त सरकार देंगे और छिपे हुए एजेंडे पर जब आपने काम करना शुरू किया तो गुरुस्वामी जी ने आपके छिपे हुए एजेंडे को भी छाप दिया। गुरुस्वामी जी का कसूर यह है कि छिपे हुए एजेंडे को उन्होंने छाप दिया। इसलिए मैं कहता हूं कि इस सरकार का मामला यह है कि—

"छुपाए बैठे हैं सीने में एक शिकस्त का राज,
तमाम शहर में फैला है जो खबर की तरह।"

तो अब यह फैल ही चुका। मैं सिर्फ इतनी बात यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आपकी सत्ता के गलियारों से दलाली के जो कारोबार हो रहे हैं वह कुछ नए नहीं, मगर जिस सरकार का यह दावा था, जो सरकार स्वदेशी की बात कर रही थी आज उसी सरकार के सहयोगी लोग—स्वदेशी जागरण मंच के जरिए उसके स्वदेशीपने की पोल खोल रहे हैं और उसके बावजूद सरकार पहलूत ही करके गुजर जाना चाहती हैं। यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। इंडोर मल्टीनेशनल कम्पनी का मसला हो, चाहे रिलायंस का मामला हो हमारे मालियाती इक्तसादी इदारों से पैसे लेकर मल्टीनेशनल कम्पनियों को पैसे देने के जो तरीके अख्त्यार किए गए हैं वह गलत हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि मुल्क का जो मालीयाती इदारा होता है उसके फायदे के लिए काम किया जाएगा या मल्टीनेशनल कम्पनियों के लिए काम किया जाएगा? क्या आपको एक कम्पनी का तजुर्बा नहीं है। बहुत पहले एक कम्पनी यहां आई थी इसी तरह कारोबार करने के लिए। उस कम्पनी ने सिर्फ कारोबार बिजनेस का नहीं किया पूरे देश का कारोबार कर लिया था। ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी के नाम से वह कम्पनी जानी जाती है। अब सिर्फ एक कम्पनी नहीं आ रही है बहुत सारी कम्पनियां आ रही हैं। ऐसा मत कीजिए कि आंखे बंद कर लीजिए, ऐसा मत कीजिए कि दिल दिमाग बंद कर लीजिए और देश की सम्पत्ति दूसरों के हाथों में चली जाए। अब मुल्क के अवाम को गुलाम नहीं बनाया जाएगा, मुल्क की आर्थिक नीतियों को गुलाम बनाया जाएगा। मुल्क के तहजीबो-तबद्दुन पर डाका डाला जाएगा। जो भी सरकार होती है, उस सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है कि उसकी सुरक्षा और उसकी रक्षा के लिए काम करे। मुझे किसी लम्बे-चौड़े भाषण की जरूरत नहीं है, मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहूंगा कि मामला इतना ज्यादा गंभीर है कि इस मसले को ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंट्री कमेटी बना कर ही हल किया जाना चाहिए। हमारे भाई साहब, हमारे रिस्पेक्टेड भाई जनाब यशवन्त सिन्हा जी जो वज़ीरे-खज़ाना हैं, बहुत सेंसिटिव आदमी हैं। ये खुद ही ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंट्री कमेटी के मैम्बर रह चुके हैं। उन्हें

अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि क्या नज़ाकतें होती हैं। जिनमें ज्वाइन्ट पार्लियामेंट्री कमेटी की जरूरत पड़ती है। तो मैं तमाम साथियों की आवाज़ में अपनी आवाज़ मिला कर बिना आप पर कोई चार्ज लगाए हुए आपसे सिर्फ यह कहना चाहूंगा कि जो चार्ज़ेज आप पर लग रहे हैं, आप उन चार्जेज़ से मुक्त होने के लिए मुल्क की जो डिमांड है, पार्लियामेंट की जो डिमांड है, हाऊस की जो डिमांड है, उस डिमांड को पूरा करके भयमुक्त सरकार देने में और करप्शन मुक्त सरकार देने में खरे उतरिए। मसला सिर्फ वज़ीरे-खज़ाना का नहीं है, मसला तो प्राईम मिनिस्टर तक पहुंच चुका है। आपके यहां तो करप्शन के हवाले से जो बातें अब छप रही हैं, उसमें आपकी सरकार यह कहना चाहती है कि करप्शन के मामले में हमारा हाल यह है कि—

> "कफूस की तीलियों से लेकर शाखे आसियां तक है,
> मेरी दुनिया यहां तक है, मेरी दुनिया वहां तक है।"

तो मुल्क को करप्शन-मुक्त सरकार चाहिए, करप्शन-लिप्त सरकार नहीं चाहिए। सरकार की यह जिम्मेदारी है कि करप्शन से अपने आप को अलग-थलग साबित करने के लिए ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी के सामने आए और ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बनाने का वायदा करे। सुक्रिया।

†[مولانا عبید اللہ خاں اعظمی "بہار": میڈم، ڈپٹی چیئرمین صاحبہ، چھوٹے چھوٹے کا سوال نہیں ہے، سوال ہے ملک میں غریبوں کے وقار اور غریبوں کے ..... کا جو چند مٹھی بھر لوگوں کے ہاتھوں میں آج سمٹ کر رہ گیا ہے۔ میڈم ہمارے سارے ساتھیوں نے اس گمبھیر مسئلے پر جس طرح تفصیل کے ساتھ باتیں کی ہیں اسکی روشنی میں اب کچھ باتیں کہنے کو نہیں رہ گئی ہیں۔ میں صرف اتنی بات کہکر اپنی بات ختم کرونگا۔

†[ ]Transilteration in Arabic Script

شری انتت رائے دیو شنکر دوبے: کچھ بھی نہیں ملا... "مداخلت"...

مولانا عبید اللہ خاں اعظمی: نہیں معاملہ یہ ہے کہ:

[دل کے پھپھولے جل گئے سینے کے داغ سے
اس گھر کو آگ لگ گئی گھر کے چراغ سے]

اس لئے بہت گمبھیر ہے یہ۔ اگر صرف ادھر سے آدھ پاؤ بتا تو آپ یہ کہکر گزر سکتے تھے کہ مسئلہ گمبھیر نہیں ہے۔ مگر جب ہمارے کولیگ مسٹر مکیش پٹیل صاحب کی طرف سے بھی یہ مسئلہ پہلے پرد ہلہ بن کر آگیا ہے سامنے۔ اس کے باوجود اگر آپ یہ کہیں کہ وہ معاملہ گمبھیر نہیں ہے تو آپ لوگ دیش کے ساتھ گمبھیر نہیں ہیں اور دیش کی سمسیاؤں کے ساتھ گمبھیر نہیں ہیں۔ میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہونگا کہ ہمارے جو بھائی اس ملک کے وزیر خزانہ اور بہت ہی بڑے مان لیڈر ہیں جناب یشونت سنہا صاحب جنکا میرے دل میں بے حد احترام ہے، میں انکی تکلیف کو خوب سمجھتا ہوں، انکی پریشانی کو پہچانتا ہوں، بہت ..... آدمی ہیں۔ میں یہ جانتا ہوں کہ:

[چھپائے بیٹھے ہیں سینے میں ایک شکست کا راز
تمام شہر میں پھیلا ہے جو خبر کی طرح]

کا آپکو کوئی حق نہیں پہنچتا، دیش کے ساتھ اور دوسروں کے ساتھ۔ دیش کی سمپتی کے ساتھ آپکو وشواس گھات کرنے کا کوئی حق نہیں پہنچتا چھپے ہوئے ایجنڈہ میں آپ کہتے ہیں کہ مشن ملک سرکار دیں گے اور چھپے ہوئے ایجنڈہ پر جب آپ نے کام کرنا شروع کیا تو گرو سوامی جی نے آپ کے چھپے ہوئے ایجنڈے کو بھی چھاپ دیا گرو سوامی جی کا قصور یہ ہے کہ چھپے ہوئے ایجنڈے کو انھوں نے چھاپ دیا اس لئے میں کہتا ہوں کہ اس سرکار کا معاملہ یہ ہے کہ:

چھپائے بیٹھے ہیں ایک شکست کا راز
تمام شہر میں پھیلا ہے جو خبر کی طرح

تو اب تو وہ پھیل ہی چکا، میں صرف اتنی بات کہنا چاہتا تھا کہ سنتہ کے گلیاروں سے دلالی کے کمار وبار ہو رہے ہیں۔ وہ کچھ نئے نہیں مگر جس سرکار کا یہ دعویٰ تھا جو سرکار سودیشی کی بات کر رہی تھی آج اسی سرکار کے سہیوگی لوگ سودیشی جاگرن منچ کے ذریعہ اسکے سودیشی پنے کی پول کھول رہے ہیں اور اس کے باوجود سرکار پہلو تہی کر کے گزر جانا چاہتی ہے یہ کوئی اچھی بات نہیں ہے۔ انڈور ملٹی نیشنل کمپنی کا مسئلہ ہو چاہے ریلائنس کا معاملہ ہو ہمارے مالیاتی اقتصادی اداروں سے

معمولی مسئلہ نہیں بہت گمبھیر مسئلہ ہے۔ مسئلہ یہ ہے بھائی، کہ آپ لوگوں نے ایک چھپا ہوا ایجنڈا دیا تھا جسکو ہمارے کو لیگ ابھی پڑھ رہے۔ ابھی بھیمکت سرکار دینے کی بات کر رہے ہیں، آپکو کرپشن سے الگ تھلگ سرکار دینے کی بات کر رہے ہیں اور:

اس سادگی پر کون نہ مر جائے اے خدا
لڑتے ہیں مگر ہاتھ میں تلوار تک نہیں

بھیمکت سرکار دینے کی بات آپنے اپنے ایجنڈے میں کی ہے، کرپشن سے ملکت سرکار دینے کی بات آپنے اپنے ایجنڈے میں کی ہے۔ ہمیں تو لگا معلوم تھا کہ ایک چھپا ہوا ایجنڈہ ہے اور ایک چھپا ہوا ایجنڈہ ہے آپ کے پاس۔ چھپا ہوا ایجنڈہ پڑھ دیا ہمارے ایک ساتھی نے ..."مداخلت"...

شری بھارتیندو پرکاش سنہل: آپکو کیا پتہ ہے ..."مداخلت"....

مولانا عبید اللہ خاں اعظمی: آج آپکا جنم دن ہے، آپکو جنم دن مبارک اور پارلیمنٹ میں..."مداخلت"... تو میں یہ عرض کر رہا تھا میڈم، ایک ہمارے ساتھی نے بی جے پی کا چھپا ہوا ایجنڈا پڑھا تو آپنے جو بات کہی تھی اس لئے کہی تھی کہ دیش نے آپ پر وشواس کر کے آپکو ووٹ دیا مگر وشواس گھات کرنے

کمیٹی بنا کر حل کیا جانا چاہیئے - ہمارے وائس پریسیڈنٹ بھائی جناب لیشونت سنہا جی جو وزیر خزانہ رہیں بہت سنسیٹیو آدمی ہیں، یہ خود بھی جوائنٹ پارلیمنٹری کمیٹی کے ممبر رہ چکے ہیں انھیں اچھی طرح سے معلوم ہے کہ کیا نزاکتیں ہوتی ہیں جن میں جوائنٹ پارلیمنٹری کمیٹی کی ضرورت پڑتی ہے، تو میں تمام ساتھیوں کی آواز میں آواز ملا کر بنا آپ پر کوئی چارج لگائے ہوئے آپ سے صرف یہ کہنا چاہوں گا کہ جو چار چیز آپ پر لاگو رہے ہیں آپ ان چار چیز سے ملک ہونے کے لئے ملک کی جو ڈیمانڈ ہے، پارلیمنٹ کی جو ڈیمانڈ ہے، ہاؤس کی جو ڈیمانڈ ہے اس ڈیمانڈ کو پورا کرنے کے لئے ملک سرکار دینے میں اور کرپشن ملک سرکار دینے میں کھرے اتریئے - مسئلہ صرف وزیر خزانہ کا نہیں ہے مسئلہ تو پرائم منسٹر تک پہنچ چکا ہے - آپ کے یہاں تو کرپشن کے حوالے سے جو باتیں اب چھپ رہی ہیں اس میں آپکی سرکار یہ کہنا چاہتی ہے کہ کرپشن کے معاملے میں ہمارا حال یہ ہے کہ:

قفس کی تیلیوں سے لیکر شاخ آشیاں تک یہ
میری دنیا یہاں تک یہ میری دنیا وہاں تک

تو ملک کو کرپشن ملک سرکار چاہیئے، کرپشن لیٹ سرکار نہیں چاہیئے سرکار کی پالیسی لیکر ملٹی نیشنل کمپنیوں کو پالیسی دینے کے جو طریقہ اختیار کئے گئے ہیں - میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں ملک کا جو مالیاتی ادارہ ہوتا ہے اسکے فائدہ کے لئے کام کیا جائیگا، یا ملٹی نیشنل کمپنیوں کیلئے کام کیا جائے گا؟ کیا آپ کو ایک کمپنی کا تجربہ نہیں ہے - بہت پہلے ایک کمپنی یہاں آئی تھی اسی طرح کا کاروبار کرنے کیلئے، اس کمپنی نے کاروبار بزنس کا نہیں کیا پورے دیش کا کاروبار کرلیا تھا - ایسٹ انڈیا کمپنی کے نام سے وہ کمپنی جانی جاتی ہے - اب صرف ایک کمپنی نہیں آرہی ہے بہت ساری کمپنیاں آرہی ہیں - ایسا مت کیجیئے کہ آنکھیں بند کر لیجیئے، ایسا مت کیجیئے کہ دل و دماغ بند کر لیجیئے اور دیش کی سمپتی دوسرے ہاتھوں میں چلی جائے - اب ملک کے مفاد کو غلام نہیں بنایا جائیگا ملک کی آر تھک نیتیوں کو غلام بنایا جائیگا - ملک کے تہذیب و تمدن پر ڈاکہ ڈالا جائیگا - جو بھی سرکار ہوتی ہے اس سرکار کی ذمہ داری ہے کہ اس کی سرکشا اور اسکی رکھشا کے لئے کام کرے - مجھے کسی بھی چوڑے بھاشن کی ضرورت نہیں ہے میں صرف اتنا کہنا چاہوں گا کہ معاملہ اتنا گمبھیر ہے کہ اس مسئلہ کو جوائنٹ پارلیمنٹری

یہ ذمہ داری ہے کہ کرپشن سے اپنے آپ کو
الگ تھلگ ثابت کرنے کے لیے جو اسٹے
پارلیمنٹری کمیٹی کے سامنے آئے اور جوائنٹ
پارلیمنٹری کمیٹی بنانے کا وعدہ کرے۔
شکریہ۔ "ختم شد"

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam Deputy Chairman, we are coming to the end of the debate demanding a JPC to inquire into the allegations made by the former Advisor to the Finance Minister, Mr. Guruswamy. As to the question of his credibility, from Shri Arun Shourie to Shri Venkaiah Naidu, they have talked about his credibility as an ex-advisor. Madam, my first point is,—it has already been made, and I repeat it—he was appointed by their own Government, by their own party, in order to implement the programmes that they initiated, to assist their own party, or they believed that Yashwant Sinhaji was not enough to implement their programmes, and, therefore, they appointed him to give him advice in the implementation of the programmes. So, you had appointed him. And the credibility stands. Moreover, Mr. Venkaiah Naidu said that he is an ex-wife. I agree with it. In a divorce petition, only an ex-wife says whether her husband was impotent. He has more credibility before the court of law. There is no doubt about it. So, his argument is credible. He has said about a nude photograph; it is in a statement. Somebody tells an Emperor, "You are not not wearing a cloth." The article is here with me. So, the nude photograph is very relevant when he said about this. So, Madam, I believe that the allegations which Mr. Guruswamy has levelled are true. Something has happened. The hon. Minister has to answer every specific query.

Shri Jethmalani also has made a point regarding the crisis in the Indian economy. Our industry comprises not steel alone. There are cement industries and so on. But you selected the steel industry and favoured, especially, the private industry. And in that private industry, you favoured a particular firm. That is one of the allegations levelled against you, and, I believe, that there is some truth in it. I have some evidence before me. The first thing is that you appointed an inter-ministerial committee which recommended the referral price of 247 dollars per tonne considering duties and other things. What happened was that when this recommendation came to the Ministers, the Ministers assembled together, and they decided to make it 302 dollars per tonne. Now, Shri Jethmalani gives a new definition. This is very serious. He says that the Inter-Ministerial Committee recommended the floor price. Only files can say whether they recommended the floor price or a referral price of 247 dollars per tonne. Which is correct? Shri Jethmalani says, it is the floor price. I say, with all authority, and I believe that it is right, that the Inter-Ministerial Committee recommended the referral price.

You decided to increase it by 55 dollars more. One important point is this. What is the basis of your calculation of this price of 247 dollars? It is the total expenditure; you have taken into account the cost of production of SAIL, a public sector company. Every one knows that SAIL's cost of production is more than that of the private sector by ten per cent. It meant a saving of 25 dollars more to the private company. Then, there is a profit component; it may be a minimum of ten per cent. This means another 25 dollars. All this means this underpricing gave a bonanza of more than 105 dollars per tonne. You can calculate it. Here is the data being published by you. Look at the production. The production, according to this data, from April to November, is 14.84 million tonnes. That is the production. They were saying that they had taken the London Metal Exchange Price of June. You are taking the June price in November or December. Then, look at this; this is an

answer to a question in the Parliament. You say that the private steel companies have been given Rs.1,838 crores by four financial institutions and more money had been given by the IDBI. Out of these Rs. 1,800 crores, more was given to one particular company, that is, ESSAR. You cannot deny that. You take it into account; the total comes to Rs. 4,410 per tonne for a particular company, which has benefited. You can calculate it; it will run into many, many crores. The question is: What is the consideration? As we know, in the Law of Contract, there is always a consideration. The Law Contract talks about consideration. So, what is the consideration? Sir, the consideration can be found out through the JPC because the allegation is that a favour has been done. Shri Ram Jethmalani and others have clarified this price fixation. I challenge that it was not the floor price, it was the referral price. The files will speak the truth.

Then, so far as the ITC is concerned, there is an allegation and I would like to quote from a report published in the *Business Standard*. It says, "Not only the UTI, the GIC is also open to the idea of selling its 11.04 per cent stake in the tobacco major, ITC, to the multinational BAT provided the price is right. The top GIC sources disclosed these facts." They have given some reasons also. The reason is that litigation may come against the Government also if ITC shares were sold. Madam, it is very clear that there was a discussion. Here is a noting by the Minister on the file. The Minister noted it on the file. The Minister never said "No". This is a photocopy of the file. This is Minister's own noting. When the file came to you for sale of UTI shares to BAT, you never said, "No"; you only said, "Let us discuss". What does it mean? Everyone in this House knows that BAT made a big battle in the boardroom and the AGM and the whole story of its attempt to take over the ITC. Everyone knows it. And they are continuing that. *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which document are you quoting?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, this is a document that has appeared in the Press.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope it is not from a file that you are quoting.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, this is a photocopy of the file which appeared in the newspaper. He can deny it. It is a photocopy and I can place it before the House. He says, "Let us discuss it". He can deny if it is not in his handwriting. It means the Minister is not averse to the idea of selling UTI shares to BAT. That is the point I am making. *(Interruptions)* This is only one page of the file. So, one point is that this particular company, ESSAR, has been helped. Secondly, it is about BAT. Thirdly, it is about the Dabhol project about which Mr. Salve has given the details. The other Members have mentioned how the other projects benefited from the Government. Lastly, one of the Members of the ruling party has given credibility to the statement of Mr. Mohan Guruswamy when he said the Prime Minister intervened in many matters. It is the Home Minister who continued to raid one of the companies, but the Prime Minister wanted to protect that particular company. Something has been said by Shri Mukesh Patel about the credibility of the Government on the floor of the House. He said, "These are the records before me. The Prime Minister refused to meet me, refused to answer my questions. Here, the Prime Minister is influenced by a coterie around him, and helping a particular business house and even preventing a raid." It is Mr. Advani, the Home Minister who continued the raid." What does it mean? The Home Minister is defying the Prime Minister. That is what Guruswamy has said here also. That is why they are losing their credibility. Madam, in totality, I would like to say that the whole matter was decided to help a particular steel company about which Mr.

Mittal is complaining. Shri Pramod Mahajan said before this House the day before yesterday that he had not gone to Mr. Guruswamy with Mr. Pramod Mittal. He said that when he walked in, Pramod Mittal was sitting there, so they discussed something. What did they discuss there? Did they discuss weather conditions in London? No. They discussed something else. We want to know as to what they discussed there. We can know about that only with a JPC probe. Therefore, we are demanding a JPC probe. This is the case. This is the FIR. These are the allegations. Without an inquiry, without a JPC, how can we know the truth? Mr. Arun Shourie must tell something because he is writing a series of articles. This House has discussed many issues, and demanded JPC on many of them. Nobody can come out with all the proof like a court of law. These allegations are based on Press reports. So, Madam, on the basis of what has been said in this House, what has been reported in the Press, the allegations of Mr. Guruswamy and also Mr. Mukesh Patel, I demand a JPC probe. I believe that only a JPC can find out as to what were the considerations in terms of contract, i.e., corruption. So, that corruption has to be probed. Therefore, I demand that there must be a JPC probe on all these issues. With these words, I conclude.

उपसभापति : चतुर्वेदी जी, आपकी पार्टी का भी समय खत्म हो गया है। उनको समय दिया है इसलिए आपको भी दे रहे है।

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : Madam, you are a very fair person, and to be fair to me and to Mr. Salve, you will give me as much time as was given to Mr. Salve, though the Congress Party's time had expired.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Actually, I was not here when Mr. Salve was speaking.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : I think, counting of minutes is there. At least, in fairness to me, I should at least be given that much of time.

उपसभापति : इतनी देर में तो आप काफी बोल लेते।

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : Thank you, Madam. I will always abide by what you ask me to do. Madam Chairperson, first of all, I commend the restraint, the decorum and the dignity with which Dr. Manmohan Singh, the Leader of the Opposition, an old friend of mine, had opened the debate.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Madam, I have a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What is that point of order?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Madam, from day before yesterday, we have been listening to various Members and we have consumed more time. I just want point out that the BJP was allotted 55 minutes, it has already consumed 74 minutes. Now, you have allowed the third speaker. I will just put it on record. We have no objection to it, but a lot of hue and cry has been raised on the point that CPI(M) has consumed more time than was allotted to it...*(Interruptions)*... So, BJP's third speaker is speaking after consuming 74 minutes, while 55 minutes were allotted to them. For record; I say this. Thank you, Madam. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM : If they think that their case is not defended well, they can field many more speakers. ....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Anyway, this Government is on borrowed time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Nilotpal Basu, this matter is very serious. That is why the Chair was generous to everyone. More time was consumed by CPI. (M); more time was consumed by CPI; more time was consumed by everybody. So, everybody proprotionately has done that. Now, even the Congress Party got more time than was allotted to them. So, let us not huddle for time. We are not... मेरी भाजी सस्ती है, मेरी तरकारी महंगी है।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Madam, we are just pointing out the fact that we have withdrawan our second speaker, Dr. Ashok Mitra.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : But, he spoke for a long time. So, let us abide by it. We should have a little more give and take ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : I am grateful to you. ...*(Interruptions)*... Madam Deputy Chairman, Dr. Manmohan Singh opened this debate with great restraint, decorum and dignity. I thought that the level of the debate will be maintained at that level. But, unfortunately, it did not happen. Actually, when I was listening to Dr. Manmohan Singh, I felt that probably he was saying something under compulsion. He himself lacked conviction in what he was saying because he was referring to the three articles ....*(Interruptions)*... If they do not like that, I will withdraw the sentence 'he lacked conviction'. But, I feel that ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do not think Dr. Manmohan Singh is so scared that he cannot say anything under pressure. ...*(Interruptions)*... He made whatever points he had. ...*(Interruptions)*... He is not here. So, I will not allow anybody to attribute any motives. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: I have also known him. He has been an academician; he has been a civil servant. He is a politician and the Leader of the Opposition. I have known him for over three decades. I know the qualities of his head and heart. I apreciate him. When I said that what he said lacked conviction, I meant that because a decision has already been taken by him and his party in this regard. So, he was saying all this under compulsion. He was obviously trying to confine himself to the three documents which were available at that time. One of them is an interview given by him and the other two are Guruswamy's writings. He did not have any supporing evidence or anything additional to support or substantiate what Mr. Guruswamy has said in his articles. He has very aptly ...*(Interruptions)*... Anyway, I do not want to say anything. Madam has been kind enough to allow me to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*... I respectfully submit that only one issue has emerged out of this discussion, that is, we are just trying to force ourselves in a situation in which we are only vulgarising the political processes and there is abuse of the democratic processes. When I say this, I say this with the utmost responsibility. I would just like to mention at this stage that there was a time when there was a private Secretary, Mr. Mathai, who wrote two books. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me develop my argument so that ...*(Interruptions)*... At that time, nobody asked for a JPC. There was a discussion and the matter was left for the Cabinet Secretary to look into how and why he was appointed and other things and what appropriate action was to be taken. The matter ended there. Now, once we allow such a situation to develop, then there will be more and more situations like this. For example, a reference has been made to three points by Dr. Manmohan Singh which Mr. Guruswamy mentioned in his articles. I agree with that. But, the way Mr. Guruswamy has said everything, is he omniscient or omnipresent? Not only that, is he the Scarlet Pimpernel of national conscience? He is pointing out everything now, after having demited or forced to demit his office. Is there a single document, is there a single paper in which he expressed his dis-agreement with what the Prime Minister was doing or the Home Minister was doing? I accept that one particular document ITC - to which a reference was made in the debate, about which he says, "He put it." About which it was said, "Please discuss." Now, "Please discuss" implication can be that you are exceeding - the Finance Minister said - your mandate. This is what he meant. He is not supposed to look into these things. He himself, in his interview, has said that

he was not a part of the administrative loop. So, he did not know what were the necessary administrative exercises that were being done. That is what he himself admits. He was the Advisor. As I said, even gereater people have, sometime been taken in. But that does not mean that there is merit to justify for a Joint Parliamentary Committee. I would like to say that much has been said about the qualities of Mohan Guruswamy. I have not known him well enough. Yes. He has joined the BJP. And I was told that he had been there for a year in Harvard. As has been mentioned, he had been with so many other Ministers, Chief Ministers and former Chief Ministers. But, I just try to draw the attention of the House to what he has said. He is an honourable man but the way he sums up tells you what he is. I just want to quote one or two points. He talked about one Ashok Tandon and his pedigree. He talks about one of his pedigree. This is the word that he has used. Not only that, he had talked about the Finance Secretary. He does not know anything about the finance. He knows only petroleum. This is what he said ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let him finish because there is no time. I have given him a few minutes ...*(Interruptions)*... Let him finish.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : Madam Deputy Chairperson, I will just come to this particular thing as to why they have brought this kind of a thing. They have brought in this kind of a thing because they know that the BJP and its allies are getting stronger day-by-day. You find that not only one but more than ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Salve, I have enough ethics to talk to you and about you ...*(Interruptions)*... There are even opinion-polls ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM : Your allies are getting stronger!...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : All that Mr. Mukesh Patil has said is,...*(Interruptions)*... He has said that he had submitted an application, a petition, to the hon. Prime Minister and the expedition that he has expected has not been materialised. A letter, a communication...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री मुकेश आर० पटेल : मैंने सीरियस एलीगेशंस लगाए है। ..*(व्यवधान)*

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : I know...*(Interruptions)*... That is what I am saying...*(Interruptions)*... He has not levelled any allegation against the Prime Minister.

SHRI MD. SALIM. Yes.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA : He levelled an allegation against him...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : If he has, it is well and right. Because, so far as Mr. Jitendra Prasada is concerned, he had been a political advisor to the Prime Minister and he knows how a coterie is developed, how a coterie will work, how allegations and counter-allegations are made. I will not say anything from my experience. But, I will only say from my observations. Dr. Manmohan Singh and everybody have been talking about the Home Minister, other Ministers and everybody. See how important he considers himself and why he has chosen the Prime Minister. He says — see his megalomania "My name was recommended. The Prime Minister has already turned down a recommendation from Shri L.K. Advani and Smt. Sushma Swaraj to make me the Chief Executive Officer of the Prasar Bharati. This is the grouse."

He thinks that he is a magalomania of a Napolcon proportion. This is the kind of language that he uses about differences. He talks about the Finance Minister that the public perception was of an amiable duffer, but he is not that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM : Instead of refuting charges, you are saying this. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : See the credibility of the person, the credibility of

the character. Then I any coming to the charges. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : Originally, his party did not field him as the main speaker. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : When I was in the Chair, you were speaking and I gave you grace time. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : Why are you saying "grace time." There is no grace. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do not know about Mr. Salve's time as a grace time because I was not in the Chair at that time. Mr. Chairman was in the Chair. It is only that Mr. Vayalar Ravi wanted some time. To balance I gave him because his name is here. So, is Mr. Chaturvedi's. But that does not mean that you have the whole time.

चतुर्वेदीजी, आपको तो ग्रेस में टाइम दिया था। अब यह बहुत हो गया।

श्री टी॰एन॰ चतुर्वेदी : मैडम मेरे पर उतनी ही ग्रेस होनी चाहिए जितनी कि साल्वेजी को थी।

उपसभापति : आपने प्वाइंट बोल दिया है। अब आप कृपया स्थान ग्रहण करिए तो मैं मंत्री जी को बोलने को बुलाऊं। ...(व्यवधान) चूंकि जबाब तो उन्होंने देना है।

श्री टी॰एन॰ चतुर्वेदी : सिर्फ दो-तीन बातें कहनी है। मैडम, जो कोटेरी ...(व्यवधान)

I won't strain your patience too much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think so. It is being strain quite a bit.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : What I said was, this mudslinging has only been started against the Prime Minister and the Government so that the public mind be a little bit under some misconception, misinterpretation. That is why this campaign of seducing, calumny bringing "coterie in the Prime Minister Office" because he has never been accused of many of these things. That is why there is a deliberate attempt and there is a desir to cover up many of the things there by the ruling party. When I will have much time to say, I will speak about this and that is why ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM : Which ruling party? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : The former ruling party. The members of which party are so impatient today. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please let him speak so that I can ask the Minister to give the reply. Otherwise, it will go on endlessly. ...*(Interruptions)*...

चतुर्वेदीजी, जब मैंने काफी एलाऊ कर दिया है।

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : Not only that, that is why there is a talk of extra-constitutional authority. Now that it has been raised that he is interfering, did he anytime said about anybody that such and such appointment was done because of the Prime Minister's adopted son-in-law and so on and so forth? This is only to bring in the family. It is to introduce the family. The motive is not to go into the facts of the case. Not only this, words like 'duplicitious' role of the Prime Minister. Sir, about the Tata Airlines, you are also aware because you were in the Chair. The other day everybody, Mr. Ibrahim, Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad, who else had not spoken for the Jet Airlines. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Salim, I am not misleading the House. The Orwellian language is yours. These are your words. ....*(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Salim, please take your seat. I will put the record straight. I was in the Chair. I do not remember the Members who participated in it. Five or six Members spoke. They spoke for the Indian Airlines. Whatever their motive, I do not attribute it to anybody.

Now, Mr. Chaturvedi, will you please sit down becuase you have taken enough time?

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: I am concluding, Madam. When was the GE Caps started? This was started in 1993.

The GE Caps came into this country .....*(Interruptions)*

Non-banking finance companies we were all talking about the role that they had played, the havoc that they had done at that time. This is not the way. On the other hand, the SEBI and the Finance Ministry have been improving those. .....*(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you do cross-talk, this is not the way because I have to control the discussion in the House. I cannot allow a question-answer session in the House. You ask of the Minister, not of him. He is not yet a Minister.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: I have quite a few things to say. I don't want to go into the Hinduja thing. When was it started? When was the agreement drawn up? That was initialled by the earlier Government. All that this Government has done to see that the risk is reduced. But it is for the concerned Minister and the Finance Minister to go into all these particular matters.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chaturvedi, please. I am calling the Minister now. Enough.

श्री टी० एन० चतुर्वेदी: मैडम, मैं एक बात कह कर खत्म कर रहा हूं।

About the credibility of the person, he is an honourable man, I say. That is why he has been behaving like this. Mavericks like him will come up more in future. Dismissed persons or somebody else like him will come up.

This is in the interview he gave today. I know what he used to tell us.

सब गोलमाल हो रहा है, सब गोलमाल हो रहा है।

He should now speak his heart out, even if it costs him his job. He has got a chance to be a hero. So far, he has been a mouse. This is the kind of language of the person. He can say that we were erring in judgement. That is why I will request Government that they should not err the way either Mathai was appointed or a person like Guruswamy was appointed.

Mohan Guruswamy's real guru is on the other side. The only thing is that he was with us for some time. He also belongs to Hyderabad. Mohan Guruswamy's real guru is elsewhere. And he is acting at the behest of his guru.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Who is his guru?

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Dr. Manmohan Singh, an able person, can find out who is in South Delhi, who owns a large house, who was earlier with the previous ruling party and is now with the present ruling party. This is one of the things that he has also to find out. Who is his guru? Trace his working.

Thank you, Madam, Chairperson. I don't think either the merits or the strengths ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chaturvedi, the more you keep on speaking, the greater will be the pressure. Please sit down.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: There is no justification for a JPC.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Chairman. .....*(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

श्री संजय निरूपम (महाराष्ट्र): मैडम .....(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: नहीं, अगर यह तरीका होगा ...(व्यवधान)

श्री संजय निरूपम (महाराष्ट्र): यह अन्याय है, यह सरासर अन्याय है। ...(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: नहीं, कोई अन्याय नहीं है। .....(व्यवधान) कोई अन्याय नहीं है। ..(व्यवधान)

SHRI SATISHCHANDRA SITARAM PRADHAN (Maharashtra): Madam, Sanjay Nirupam may be given one minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will never finish in one minute.

SHRI SATISHCHANDRA SITARAM PRADHAN: He will.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, one minute. I will go by it. It is 4-59 p.m. now. Speak.

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मुझे 5 मिनट दीजिएगा। ....**(व्यवधान)**

5.00 P.M.

मैडम, मैंने आप के पास पत्र भेजा है और सिर्फ 5 मिनिट मांगे हैं।

उपसभापति: 5 मिनट नहीं, आप के लीडर ने एक मिनिट कहा है, आप एक मिनिट बोलिए।

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मैंने आप से अनुमति मांगी है।

उपसभापति: आप अगर बहस करेंगे तो वह भी निकल जाएगा। ...**(व्यवधान)**... उन्हें डिस्टर्ब मत कीजिए।

One minute is one minute. This is a House. This is not something on which we haggle about.

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मेहरबानी जो आपने मुझे वक्त दिया हालांकि वक्त की यहां जबर्दस्त किल्लत है। मैडम, स्वामियों के विचार पर इस देश में अक्सर चर्चा होती रही है। यह अपने देश की परंपरा रही है, लेकिन परंपरा अनुसार हमारे यहां स्वामी विवेकानन्द जी के विचार पर चर्चा होती है, स्वामी अरविन्द के विचार पर चर्चा होती है, स्वामी दयानन्द जी के विचार पर चर्चा होती है, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि शनिवार से हम लोग एक नए स्वामी "गुरूस्वामी" के विचार पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं। महोदया, चर्चा की जाए, उससे मुझे तकलीफ नहीं है, चर्चा होनी चाहिए, लेकिन इस पूरी चर्चा में ईमानदारी का जो प्रवचन दिया जा रहा है वह किस तरफ से दिया जा रहा है, यह गौर करने वाली बात है? यह प्रवचन वह लोग दे रहे हैं जिन्होंने 50 सालों में भ्रष्टाचार का पूरा इतिहास लिखा है, जाने कितने घोटाले किए हैं? अगर मैं घोटाले गिनाना शुरू करूं तो रात हो जाएगी। यूरिया घोटाला, बोफोर्स घोटाला तो अभी तक पूरा नहीं हुआ, शेयर घोटाला, शक्कर घोटाला और अब कहते हैं कि इस नए घोटाले की जांच की जाए। मैडम, इतने घोटालों का क्या हुआ? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी: यह बात तो हमारे मुकेश पटेल साहब कह रहे हैं, आप उन की बात ...

THE DEUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Azmi, it is not going on record.

आजमी साहब, अभी आप बैठिए, प्लीज आप बैठिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... नहीं, मैंने आप को इजाजत नहीं दी है। There is a limit to a discussion in the House. You have to stop.

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, सवाल नैतिकता का है।

उपसभापति: आप का टाइम खत्म हो गया, बैठ जाइए।

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, ऐसे नहीं होगा।

उपसभापति: ऐसा ही होगा। यह कोई तरीका नहीं है। एक मिनिट हो गया, आप जल्दी बोल दीजिए।

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मुझे स्टील के प्रश्न पर ...

उपसभापति: देखिए, मैं आप को बता देती हूं कि पूरा भाषण नहीं होगा। आप के लीडर ने हाउस में खड़े होकर एक मिनिट कहा है, इसलिए आप जल्दी बोलकर अपनी बात खत्म कीजिए। अब इस डिस्कसन को खत्म करना है।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: मैडम, मैं इस पैकट को सदन के सामने रखना चाहती हूं कि श्री अरविन्द को स्वामी अरविन्द कभी नहीं कहा जाता था। उन को श्री अरविन्द कहा जाता था।

Who is Swamy Arvind?

श्री संजय निरूपम: आप लोगों के नए स्वामी, गुरूस्वामी हो गए हैं। आप अब किसी और स्वामी को नहीं जानते। ...**(व्यवधान)**... मैडम, मुझे बोलने दिया जाए।

मैडम, स्टील के मुद्दे पर दो बातें यहां पर कही गयी है। एक आरोप यह है कि एक पार्टिकुलर कंपनी को सलेक्टिव एप्रोच अपनाते हुए मदद की गयी और उस कंपनी का नाम "इस्सार" है कहा गया है कि "इस्सार" के लिए फायनेंस मिनिस्टर ने फायनेंसियल इंस्टीट्यूशंस को बुलाकर, उन को लोन देने के लिए एक मीटिंग रखी, यह एक आरोप है। मैडम, मैं उस आरोप के बारे में बताना चाहता हूं कि खुद श्रीमान् गुरूस्वामी जी का जो

आलेख "बिजनेस इंडिया" में छपा है, उस में कहा है कि,

> "But the sanctions mixed the plan. ESSAR naturally believed that the Government had an obligation to settle this as per the public pronouncements after sanctions were imposed. The FM told me that there was indeed such an obligation."

मैडम, जो "इस्सार" कंपनी है, उस को पिछले साल की 11 मई से पहले एक यू०एस० कंपनी से लोन एप्रूव हुआ और 11 मई को जब न्यूक्लिअर एक्सप्लोजन होता है, उस के बाद हमारे ऊपर यू०एस० सेंक्शंस लगती हैं और हम उस सदन में चर्चा करते हैं कि इन सेंक्शंस का हमारी इकानोमी पर बहुत बुरा असर पड़ेगा, पर हमारी इंडस्ट्रीज को अगर कोई बुरा असर पड़ेगा। हमारे फायनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने इसी सदन में कहा था कि नहीं, इंडस्ट्रीज को अगर कोई बुरा असर पड़ेगा तो मैं संभालूंगा और बुरा असर नहीं पड़ने दूंगा। महोदया, न्यूक्लिअर एक्सप्लोजन की वजह से एक पर्टिकुलर कंपनी को यू०एस० कंपनी ने लोन देने से मना कर दिया तब अगर हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री ने उस कंपनी के मालिक को बुलाकर बिठाया, बाकी सारी फायनेंसियल इंस्टीट्यूशंस—आई०डी०बी०आई० बगैरा के आफिसर्स को लेकर वह बैठे और उस के लिए लोन अरेंज करने की बात की तो मुझे नहीं लगता कि इसमें कोई गुनाह किया गया। यह सरकार का आब्लीगेशन था और उस आब्लीगेशन को सरकार ने पूरा करने की कोशिश की।

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: He is giving a totally wrong information. That money of $20 million was to be returned, not to be wasted. This information that he is giving is totally wrong. It is misleading to the House. *(Interruptions)*

उपसभापति: आप बैठिए।

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, ये जिस गुरूस्वामी की बात कर रहे हैं, उसी गुरूस्वामी को मैं ने कोट किया।

उपसभापति: देखिए, जवाब देने का काम मंत्री का होता है व रिकार्ड करेक्ट करने के लिए अगर वह गलत बोल रहे हैं तो मंत्री जी बोलेंगे। आप अभी खत्म कर दीजिए।

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, स्टील के बारे में दूसरा मुद्दा है ...

उपसभापति : नहीं, नहीं, पूरी स्टील मिनिस्टरी पर आप डिसकस नहीं कर सकते। इतने कम समय में पूरी स्टील मिनिस्टरी पर डिसकस नहीं हो सकता। प्लीज, अपने दो शब्द कहिए और बैठ जाइए।

श्री संजय निरूपम : मैडम, अब हम पूरे मामले के ऊपर कांग्रेस और विपक्ष के जो माननीय सदस्य बोले हैं उनकी डिमांड आई है कि इसकी जे०पी०सी० के जरिए जांच हो, लेकिन हमारी पार्टी का जो स्टेंड है वह यह है कि बोइंग ए मपोर्टिंग पार्टी आफ द गर्वनमेंट, हम लोग जे०पी०सी० की डिमांड के खिलाफ हैं। हम इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं। मैं इतना आपको बताना चाहूंगा कि कांग्रेस के साथियों की बात पर चतुर्वेदी जी ने कहा कि इनके एलीगेशन में कोई दम नहीं है,...**(व्यवधान)**... एक मिनट मुझे बोलने दीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी : अभी आपकी पार्टी के सदस्य मुकेश पटेल जी जे०पी०सी० की मांग कर रहे थे और अब आप विरोध कर रहे हैं। यह कौनसी नीति है?

†[مولانا عبید اللہ خاں اعظمی: ابھی آپکی پارٹی کے ممبر مکیش پٹیل جی۔ جے پی سی کی مانگ کر رہے تھے اور اب آپ مخالفت کر رہے ہیں یہ کونسی نیتی ہے۔]

श्री संजय निरुपम : ठीक है, जे०पी०सी० की मांग इस आधार पर की गई कि उस एलीगेशन में दम है। जब चतुर्वेदी जी ने कहा कि आपके एलीगेशान में दम नहीं है तो आप सबने उठकर कहा कि शिव सेना वाले सदस्य ने एलीगेशन लगाया, उसके पास प्रूफ है, इसका मतलब यह कि आपके पास प्रूफ नहीं है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभापति : अच्छा, हो गया। अब लड़ाई झगड़ा नहीं चाहिए। आप उधर देखकर मत बोलिए। अपनी बात बोलिए।

श्री संजय निरुपम : मैडम, प्रूफ की बात हो रही है तो फिर हमारे शिव सेना के एक सदस्य श्रीमान मुकेश पटेल जी की तरफ बात है। मुकेश पटेल जी के जो पत्राचार हुए हैं प्रधान मंत्री कार्यालय से या पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्टरी से, उस पत्राचार में कोई दोष रह गया है,

†[ ]Transilteration in Arabic Script

उसका सही ढंग से उन्हें जवाब नहीं मिला है। इसलिए मैं मुकेश पटेल जी की तरफ से डिमांड करता हूं सरकार से कि उनके पत्रों का सही ढंग से जवाब दिया जाए और उनकी जो शंकाएं है उन शंकाओं का समाधान किया जाए और अगर कोई भ्रष्टाचार हो तो उस भ्रष्टाचार का प्रोपर ढंग से जांच की जानी चाहिए, लेकिन यह जे०पी०सी० के खिलाफ है। धन्यवाद, मैडम।

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी : वह तो हाउस की प्रोपर्टी है, जो उन्होंने बोला है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभापति : अच्छा, अब मंत्री जी को बोलने दीजिए, अब किसी को नहीं बोलना है। चूंकि मंत्री जी ने किसी को डिस्टर्ब नहीं किया है इसलिए कृपया आप उनको डिस्टर्ब मत कीजिए।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम : मंत्री जी तो खुद डिस्टर्ब है। ...(**व्यवधान**)

†[श्री मोहम्मद सलीम : मंत्री जी तो खुद डिस्टर्ब हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...]

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal) : He is already very disturbed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please be serious. Let him answer.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I am a little tired. that is all.

Today, Madam, what they call is the Ides of March. Therefore, in this debate if we have some flashes of Julius Caesar, we should not be surprised.

Madam Deputy Chairperson, in my reply to this debate which has started on Saturday, I shall try and confine myself to the facts as I know them. I will begin with first things first. Shri Mohan Guruswamy was appointed by me as a consultant in the Department of Expenditure with the designation of Advisor to the Finance Minister. So, all those hon. Members who were raising issues about his status would please understand this very clearly that there is absolutely no ambiguity in this. He was *Advisor to the Finance Minister*. That was the designation, but basically a consultant who has been given that designation. He was a full-time consultant. He was appointed by no other person than me.

श्री आलमकवि बैरागी (**मध्य प्रदेश**) : किसने नियुक्त किया? आप तो पहचानते भी नहीं थे उस आदमी को।

उपसभापति : अभी मंत्री जी को बोलने दीजिए, प्लीज।

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I can only pity the great ignorance with which this question has been put. I have known Mr. Guruswamy since 1984. As the hon. Member, Mr. Jayant Malhoutra, pointed out here in this House, we have been on the first-name-terms for a very long time. So, he was no stranger to me. I alone am responsible for the decision to appoint him as my Advisor in the Ministry of Finance.

Now, he was appointed on the 3rd August. His services were terminated on the 3rd of February. The points which have been raised here in this House relate to, basically, three types. It has been said here, Madam Deputy Chairperson, that the reason why Mr. Guruswamy's charges assumed importance is because he was in a very crucial position as Adviser to the Finance Minister.

(**MR. Chairman** *In the Chair*)

He had a grand-stand view of what was happening. I will come back to this argument because it is a very important argument, to my mind, that if any other person, any Tom, Dick and Harry, had raised the kind of issues which Mr. Guruswamy has raised, perhaps, this House would not be discussing them. The only reason why this House, in its wisdom, demanded a discussion, Sir, and you, in your judgment, permitted the discussion was on account of the fact that he occupied a very, very important and crucial position in Government, namely,

†[ ]Transilteration in Arabic Script

Adivser to the Finance Minister. As Adviser to the Finance Minister, it is the general belief here and elswhere outside this House, he was privy to practically everything that was going on in the Finance Ministry and in other wings of the Government with which the Finance Ministry was concerned. Therefore, the issues that he has raised or the imporprieties to which he has made a reference are something on which, according to my distinguished and hon. colleagues from the opposition, there is a need for a Joint Parliament Committee. When I say there are basically three types of issues, one is that which can be described as purely of a political nature, when he is talking, for instance, of differences between the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. Now, the diffferences between the Prime Minister and the Home Minister are not issues which are referred to the Ministry of Finance. Dr. Manmohan Singh, I am sure, will confirm this. So, he was not privy to that because he was Adviser to the Finance Minister. He was not (*Interruptions*).

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: He was in a position to know.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: He was in a position to know; like every citizen in this country, he was in a position to know. The point I am making is that if Mohan Guruswamy was Adviser to the Finance Minister, if he makes an allegation that there was something wrong with the way we fixed the steel floor prices, then that is something which I must stand up here and answer. But, if Mohan Guruswamy is saying that there were differences between Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee who is the Prime Minister of this country and Mr. L.K. Advani who is the Home Minister, then, I do not have to stand up here and answer that. Mr. Mohan Guruswamy claims credit for it, or he makes a statement that my Private Secretary was appointed by the RSS Chief and that shows the intrusion, the invasive character of that organisation in affairs of governance. And in the same breath, he claims that that Private Secretary went away for whatever reason. He is the one who hand-picked my present Private Secretary. Mr. Chaturvedi was talking about megalomania. I am not going into that. The Point I am making, Sir, is that there are issues to which he was privy as Adviser to the Finance Minister and there are issues to which he was not privy as Adviser to the Finance Minister.

Therefore, when we discussed those issues, we have to differentiate between these two kinds of issues, and I don't think it will be proper or just on the part of this hon. House to go into those issues which he has raised, with which he was not concerned as advisor to the Finance Minister. I think on that, there will be absolutely no difference of opinion. The other thing which flows from this line of argument that I am pursuing is that, and I am grateful to Mr. Salve because he has said it very clearly. I am also grateful to the hon. Leader of the opposition because he has also said it that they are not levelling any charges. I am grateful to you, Sir for having ruled that in the discussion, in this debate that we are having, We will confine ourselves to the words written or spoken by Shri Guruswamy, and that we will not go beyond that, and I am happy that the hon. Members have confined themselves to what he has said. I said, apart from what the hon. Member, Shri Arun Shourie, has referred to, Mr. Guruswamy has himself said that he is not levelling any charges. He never levelled any charges of corruption. Even when it was pointedly asked: "was I on the take? Was somebody else involved?" he said: "He is not levelling any charges of corruption about that. He is very clear." Anyone here, in this House, must also realise that any other issue that he is raising or any other allegation that he is making, given the position that he occupied, he was in a position to substantiate them with documents, with proof. He was my advisor. He was privy to everything, as hon.

Members believed here, that was happening in the Finance Ministry. Today, when he is not with me, today, when he is writing articles, giving interviews, he certainly would have been in a position, if it was so, to not merely depend on words but to quote from documents and say that this is the charge that I am making and this is the proof that I am giving. Why hasn't Mr. Guruswamy given proof of the issues or the charges that he has raised? The simple reason is that there are none. Now, I will take up one by one the issues which he has raised and the issues which have been raised in this House. Much has been made here of the fact that we tried to dispose of the shares of the ITC that the UTI held to the British American Tobacco Company, BAT. Now, this is something which has been published. I think, Mr. Vayalar Ravi, was quoting from the note that Mr. Guruswamy had submitted to me, on which I had said : "Please discuss." This is in public domain. How does the note of the advisor to the Finance Minister begin? "Recently, there have been reports in the press about a petition, signed by several MPs, favouring UTI selling its holdings in ITC to BAT." I deduced that unless BAT actually wants to take over ITC fully, this would not have happened. What would not have happened? The MPs would not have written this letter.

Sir, a newsreport appeared in the "Economic Times", if I am not mistaken, on the 18th of January. The headline was "MPs' batting for UTI may help BAT uptake in ITC". And this newsreport went on to say that UTI was willing to offload its shares to the ITC shares but it was the Ministry of Finance, the bad, bad Ministry of Finance which was standing in the way of this very good, laudable decision that the UTI wanted to take. And it referred to the fact that MPs had written. This was, Sir, on the 18th January, 1991. Then, all this came out in the open and the UTI-ITC-BAT thing assumed the kind of proportions which Mr. Guruswamy's articles had lent it. I went into this question, I made inquiries in my own Ministry whether we had received this letter of the Members of Parliament. We did not have any record. I made inquiries from the Prime Minister's office; So many MPs were writing; maybe, they wrote to the Prime Minister, not to the Finance Minister. And, Sir, this is in Public domain. There is a letter which has been signed by over 40 Member of Parliament five of them belong to this hon. House and which is dated the 12th of January, 1999. The report about this appeared in the "Economic Times" on the 5th of March, 1999. 5th of March, 1999. Before that, the Prime Minister also did not know anything about this, nor his office. More or less, along the same lines, as was there in the "Economic Times" newsreport, now my Adviser put a certain note to me, and he says he has also seen these reports, and, if UTI were to sell the ITC shares to BAT, than what quantum of shares should be sold, and at what price it should be sold. And he is on record in one of these interviews ....*(interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal,): What is the date of that note of Guruswamy?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: 20th January.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: That means you also did not get the letter.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: No Sir, this letter, because it was addressed to the hon Prime Minister, was received in the Prime Minister's Office only on the 5th of March. The date of the letter is printed "12th January, 1999". It has been corrected, by hand, to read "5th March, 1999". And, as I said, there are five distinguihed Members of this House who had signed this letter. The rest are....*(interruptions)*....

SHRI MD. SALIM: You can name them.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: When there was the question of MPs' letter during the period of Tulmohan Ram and L.N. Mishra, there was a lot of debate. You know, Sir, that Tulmohan Ram had to resign. Let us probe into whether the signatures are genuine or not.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: If you wish, Sir, I am prepared to get a copy of this letter authenticated and put it on the Table of the House because, as I said, this is in public domain. It appeared three months before or two months before. If you want, I will do that. They have said in this letter:—

> "Respected Prime Minister,
>
> We would like to bring to your kind attention, though, time and again, the Government had been advocating greater authonomy for public sector, still there exists a lot of confusion in the decision-making process. Unit Trust of India, a key financial institution in the public sector is passing through acute financial crisis. With a view to overcoming the problems though UTI has decided to square up the stocks of ITC which it has been holding, due to obvious reasons, the Ministry of Finance is not allowing UTI to go ahead with the sale of the ITC shares in the market."

"There is every reason to believe that the Ministry of Finance is making concerted effort to help ITC, which has indulged in tax evasion. The indulgence of the Ministry of Finance is contributing to a sharp fall in the market price of ITC. And there may not be remunerative returns to UTI on the sale of ITC shares at a later date. In this way, the Minsitry of Finance is trying to help a multi-national company at the cost of a premier financial institution. This is being brought to your notice with the hope that immediate corrective steps would be taken to bail out UTI from financial crisis." This is the purport of the letter. It does not talk about BAT. It merely says that the Minsitry of Finance should not stand in the way of the UTI selling its ITC shares. This is the thrust of the letter. They did not say,-"sell it to BAT." But may advisor, who read this report in the "Economic Times" said, there have been reports in the Press about a petition signed by several Member favouring UTI selling its holdings in ITC to BAT." It means, he went by the Economic Times report. Then what happened? This note came to me. I said, please discuss it. Then, the next day, that is, on the 21st of January, he wrote again in the margin—because it is all there in *India Today*, or, in one of these magazines — that he discussed it with the Chairman of the UTI, who had agreed with this thrust. Because what Mr. Guruswamy tried to do in this note is this. He said in one of his interviews also, that he was not opposed to UTI selling the ITC shares. In fact, he was saying, why six per cent? Why not a larger percentage? In fact, he was saying that UTI should sell a larger percentage of shares that it was holding, to BAT but it should be at this price. And the price was three times the price that he imagined. UTI was selling normally at Rs. 800/-, or, something/like that. And he wanted it to go up to Rs. 2400/- or Rs. 2500/-. And it is on this basis that a deduction was made by him. A figure appeared in one of his articles, or, interviews, saying that he was trying to save the Exchequer and the nation a sum of Rs. 8,000 crores, I am reminded of a story of a person who reached home one evening and told his wife that he had saved Rs. 2/-. And his wife asked him, 'how did you save Rs. 2/-? And that persons said, 'I came running behind the bus'. And she was very angry with him, she said that 'you should have run behind a taxi, you would have saved Rs. 50/-. So, Sir, as Mr. Arun Shouric was saying, put any figure ...*(interruptions)*. I will come to that, Put any figure, it should have been four times, it should have been ten times, Instead of Rs. 8,000/-, we could have got a figure of Rs. 15,000/- or Rs. 20,000/- What is the fact of the

matter? The fact of the matter is that UTI, until this date, never received any offer from BAT for sale of its ITC shares to BAT. That is one point. The second point is that the UTI never, never considered a proposal to dispose of the UTI shares either to BAT or to anybody else. This is the truth. And this is a huge smoke; huge smoke. Why were the Members of Parliament interested in UTI selling its ITC shares. I don't know. I really don't know that and I will not hazard a guess. But there is not a piece of paper, Sir, in the Ministry of Finance to the effect that we were either 'for' or 'against' the sale of these shares. There is absolutely nothing to it. I checked up this position from the Chairman of the UTI, he told me that there was no proposal, there is no proposal, to get rid of the ITC shares. This is one part.

Dr. Manmohan Singh is sitting here. He made a point about the governance, the decisions taken and the FIs' autonomy. I would like to say with all humility that we are trying to continue those wholesome traditions and, therefore, I wrote on the note of my Adviser, "Please discuss". This is what I had in mind. The UTI holds shares of hundreds of companies. They are in this business and they are selling shares and buying shares every day in the stock-market. It is not the business of the Ministry of Finance to tell the UTI as to what shares they should sell and what shares they should buy. It certainly is not part of the responsibility of the Ministry of Finance to suggest to the UTI at what prices they should sell the shares and at what prices they should buy the shares. Therefore, I, as Finance Minister, had absolutely no desire to interfere in the affairs of the UTI which rightfully belong to them and, therefore, I took no interest in this matter. It is another matter that I had a letter in December from an hon. Member of the other House. He wrote to the Prime Minister and he wrote to me about the same matter. On the 5th of February, much before the 22nd February article of Mr. Guruswamy appeared, I wrote a letter to him saying that there was no proposal to sell the ITC shares on the part of the UTI. On 5th March I answered a question in the other House where I said that no such proposal had ever been there. Here in this House we have talked about the Ministry's interference; we have talked about the UTI selling their shares; we have talked about the BAT. I will place this on the Table of the House. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: We are not interested in the Lok Sabha. You have mentioned about five Members of the Rajya Sabha. *(Interruptions)*... You give the names of those five Members of the Rajya Sabha. (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Mohan Guruswamy has filed a caveat. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUTPA: It is not Mr. Guruswamy. We would like to know who those hon. Members are, who are looking for an opportunity so that the shares are to be sold to BAT to give then an advantage. ...*(Interruptions)*... who are those Members? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I said, Sir, these hon. Members of Parliament are not saying in their letter--I read out the text-- to sell them to BAT. They may be saying, "sell them". ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA. How can it be that you thinking? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I am not thinking. I am saying it upfront. I am saying it as honestly as possible and I will authenticate the letter of the MPs and I will place it on the Table of the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Why don't you mention the names? ...*(Interruptions)*... Why don't you authenticate it now? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Because I don't want to take the time of the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: You say that you will place it on the Table of the House. Why don't you mention the names now? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The point is either you believe me or not. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Why are you avoiding it? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I am not avoiding. Those names are here. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Then let us know the names. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Why are you holding them back?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I am not holding anything back. I said, "I will put it on record". ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I will have to authenticate this letter. This letter says something, something and RS 187. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Who is RS 187? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I don't know. RS 153. I don't know. ...*(Interruptions)*... This is how it is written here. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: You have also to find out who RS 153, etc., are. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I will place it on the Table of the House. Then we will identify those names. ...*(Interruptions)*... We will find out. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am reading them out. *(Interruptions)*.... Who is RS 187? ...*(Interruptions)*... Who is RS 153? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Andhra Pradesh) : Did you say 187?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: This is what it looks like to me. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: I am 187. *(Interruptions)*.. I don't know anything about what you say. *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What is the credibility of this letter? *(Interruptions)*.. What is the credibility of this letter? *(Interruptions)*... It gives a date. *(Interruptions)*.. What is the credibility of the letter? *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM: Normally, we put the division number so that when the Ministers receive it they can identify the members from the division list. *(Interruptions)*....

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Why doesn't the Minister disclose the names? *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The whole thing is intriguing. A date is given. The date is changed. The hon. Minister speaks of the number...*(Interruptions)* It is highly intriguing...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MD. SALIM: You take a decision first and then you procure a letter ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It might have been subsequently cooked up ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MD. SALIM: Everything was going on without records... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I don't attribute motives to him...*(Interruptions)*the whole thing has been completely cooked up ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Are the allegations cooked up? *(Interruptions)*

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: We would like to know who No. 153 is, and who the other Members are ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MD. SALIM: The Lok Sabha will take care of it ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: We are interested in Rajya Sabha ...*(Interruptions)* We would like to know the names ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश): माननीय सभापति जी, माननीय सदस्य ने जिस पत्र का उल्लेख किया है ...(**व्यवधान**)... मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूंगा कि वे कौन से सदस्य हैं जिनके नामों का उल्लेख किया गया है, ताकि वे बता सकें कि उन्होंने हस्ताक्षर किए थे या नहीं किए थे? ....(**व्यवधान**)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It is a Lok Sabha letterhead...(*Interruptions*) That letterhead, which I am able to see from here, appears to be the Lok Sabha letterhead. If the Rajya Sabha Members have signed it, don't they have their own letterheads? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MD. SALIM: It might have been signed jointly...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Whatever it may be, it is highly intriguing...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: If the Chair directs the Minister, he has to authenticate it and place it before the House...(*Interruptions*) Sir, the point is that their case has got punctured. That is why they want to divert the attention...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: We must have access to the letter. It must be placed on the Table of the House...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, we would like that letter to be pleaced on the Table of the House...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear the Minister.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I can only offer...(*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: I have a simple question...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Please let him reply. He wants to say somthing...(*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: On such an important letter, why could he not find the names of the Members corresponding to their Division Nos., before coming to the House? Why didn't he take time to check it out before coming to the House? It is very simple...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him answer...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: You must be cogenet. The date has changed. Names are not there. What is this? You want us to believe everything. We cannot believe everything...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, what is happening? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: I have not signed anything. I am not aware of that letter...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear him...(*Interruptions*) He wants to say something.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I can only offer...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You hear what he wants to say.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, the point that I was making is that this letter has been received in the Prime Minister's office on the 5th of March. It is true that it is on the Lok Sabha letterhead, and the majority of the Members who have signed this belong to the other House. But I cannot make out the signatures. It is written, RS-something, RS-something...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MD. SALIM: You had been a Member of the Rajya Sabha. It is not RS-something. It is some number...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI YASWANT SINHA: Sir, with your permission, I can offer to lay it on the Table of the House...(*Interruptions*) If you don't give me the permission, how can I lay it on the Table?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want my permission?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: This is what I said. I offer to lay it on the Table provided I am permitted by the Chairman to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right...(*Interruptions*)

कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे: आपने एक नम्बर बताया है और नम्बर बताने में आपको क्या एतराज है?...(**व्यवधान**)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please listen to him. He wants my permission to lay it on the Table of the House. I permit him to lay it on the Table of the house after its authentication.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: After authentication, I lay it on the Table of the House. Sir, one more point...(*Interruptions*)

DR.BIPLAB DASGUPTA: You tell us either the names or the numbers. you have to say either of the two...(*Interruptions*)

कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे: सर, आपने इनको परमिशन दी है। इन्होंने कुछ और नम्बर भी कोट किए हैं अगर मेम्बर्स का नाम भी बता दें तो ज्यादा आसान हो जाएगा।...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am on a different point, Sir. Sir, Members do not sign by giving their Division Numbers only; they sign and then give the Number. Therefore, it is necessary to know how the letter was signed, what the names are, because it is a reflection on this House also. We would like to know how the Members did it and why the hon. Minister is taking cognizance of a letter which appears to be spurious, absolutely spurious.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: With great respect to this House, I would submit that I never said that all the signatures were genuine. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Then, why do you... (*Interruptions*) What is this? (*Interruptions*) This is terrible. (*Interruptions*) I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: सभापति जी, जब मंत्री खुद कह रहे हैं कि मैं जेनुअन सिग्नेचर नहीं मानता हूं तो आइडेंटिफाई कैसे कर रहे हैं?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, these names have appeared in a newspaper. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear him. (*Interruptions*) Let me hear you one by one.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I have a cutting of a newspaper. Some of these names have appeared in a newspaper. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let me hear. Why do you respond? (*Interruptions*) Let me hear him first.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, may I respectfully submit that there was a news item in the *Economic times* dated 18-1-1999, 'MPs batting for UTI may help BAT's stake in ITC'. This is the heading. This is a three-column news item in this newspaper. In that, there are names of some hon. Members also. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, Let me hear. (*Interruptions*) Let him complete and then I can say something. You don't want me to hear him? Why do you interrupt?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: First of all, may I humbly submit that there is nothing wrong for any Member of Parliament to write a letter to the Prime Minister or to the Finance Minister. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't you let him complete? (*Interruptions*)

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Our party never said that writing a letter to the Prime Minister is wrong. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear him, Why are you replying to him? I can reply to him. (*Interruptions*) Let me hear him.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: In this news item there are a few names. It only said that the MPs included Shri P.C. Upendra, Shri B. Hoda, Shri Y. Naidu and Shri S.S. Reddy. They said that UTI

should be allowed to go about... (*Interruptions*) My point is, if it is a fake letter, then it appeared on 18-1-1999...(*Interruptions*) Sir, what is this running commentary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear. Why are you replying? (*Interruptions*) Let me hear. Then I can say something.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: If according to some members in this House, this seems to be a fake letter... (*Interruptions*) As members of Parliament we go through newspapers regularly. This item appeared on 18-1-1999. Till today, no hon. Member has mentioned... (*Interruptions*) Only a few names have been mentioned here. According to the Minister, there are forty. (*Interruptions*) Whether it is the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha, a member is a member. So, in that case, the hon. members would have clarified that they haven't made such a representation. (*Interruptions*) Sir, the authenticity cannot be the question. The only thing is that their Division Number, their I.C. Number has to be verified and then once it is placed before the House, the House has got the liberty to go through the names and then, as Shri Kishore Chandra Deo pointed out... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear. You will be given a chance to say something. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, the hon. Minister has read out one of the Members number-sign-187. The hon. Member whose number is 187 is saying that he has not signed it. It will only be verified once it is placed on the Table of the House. The Minister cannot take the authenticity of the signature of every Member because, as I told you, any representation made to any Minister or to the Prime Minister they go through the merits of the case and don't go through the signatures whether this man has signed or that man has signed or not. So, my request to the Chair is, you please allow the Minister tomorrow or today to lay it on the Table of the House, and let the House go through the name. If somebody has not signed it. Then they can deny it... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I have a point...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear one by one...(*Interruptions*) I will also hear you.

SHRI SURESH PACHOURI: How can the hon. Member stop him from speaking? ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to say something?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I am on a different pront. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Leader of the Opposition say something.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have great regard and respect for the hon. Finance Minister, but I would like to point out to him with due deference and respect that there are some details about this letter which to say the lease are intreguing. There is a letter which bears the date of 12th January. That letter's contents are known by about the same time to the former Advisor to the Finance Minister. Somehow, that letter is recorded in the files of the Prime Minister on 5th March, 1999. We have not brought this matter, but in this article, Mr. Guruswamy has further alleged, and I would like to hear from the hon. Finance Minister if he has any knowledge of or any views on that, that when the Finance Minister returned that note that he had sent to him. On that very night, according to Mr. Guruswamy, he received an offer from a particular entity to silence this. Therefore, Sir, there are circumstances around this letter which do create problems for all of us. We have no intention to indulge in with-hunting, but I must submit with all sincerity that there are aspects of this letter, which do cause us worry.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I have my point. My point is, the hon. Minister while referring to the letter, participating in the discussion, at the beginning, he said that a number of MPs wrote a letter, which includes five Members of this House. This is what he was saying. Then, I requested him to let us know about the date of the letter. Then, he said that the date of the letter was somewhere in January, but it has been changed to somewhere in March. Then, I asked him as to what the names were. He did not tell the names. He quoted the number.Then, again responding to my querry, he is just now saying, "I don't believe that all the signatures are genuine. How is it? How atrocious is it? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI YASWANT SINHA: I never said that.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, the honour of this House is in your hands. If the hon. Minister does not believe that the signatures are not all genuine, then why was he banking on this letter to reply to the discussion here? How is it? Where is the House leading to? ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. Mr. Kishore Chandra Deo. His division number was mentioned, and he has a right to say something.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Why has he said that he does not believe that the signatures are genuine? If the signatures were not genuine, then why was he harping on the letter so long and referring that five Members of this House have signed it? This is atrocious. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI YASWANT SINGH: I did not say it. This absolutely wrong. ...(*Interruptions*)... Look into the records. You are putting words into my mouth. I merely said that nobody can vouch for those signatures. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, look at the records. He said that he does not believe that all the signatures ar genuine. Look into it. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him say something. ...(*Interruptions*)... Let Mr. Kishore Chandra Deo say something.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: Mr. Chairman, Sir, while referring to a particular letter, the hon. Minister mentioned that five Members of this House had signed it. We asked for the names. The division number which he mentioned happens to be my division number, and I seek your protection. Sir, this is an attempt to malign my name. Normally when one signs any letter, one also puts his name in the bracket. I am not one of those who signs this type of letters. I do not recall or remeber signing any such letter. I take a strong objection for referring to my Division No. I request that...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, it is a question of privilege of a Member of this House. His signatures have been forged by mentioning his division No. When Shri Kishore Deo has denied this on the floor of the House, it means that his signatures might have been forged. You know about the precedents here and in the other House. ...(*Interruptions*)... Even in Tul Mohan case when signatures were forged, at that time an inquiry was conducted.

Sir, when I was in the Lok Sabha and you were in this House, in those days there was a case when Mr. L.N. Mishra's signatures were forged. At that time also an inquiry was conducted and some action was taken. I remember that case. Sir, you also know about that. Forging signatures on a letter is a very serious matter. It is a question of privilege of the Member cocnerned. It needs a thorough probe. ...(*Interruptions*)... I am quoting it. ...(*Interruptions*)... That is more important. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: We are not discussing the other House. ...(*Interruptions*)... We are discussing the

dignity of this House. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why should we delay the reply?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I am intrigued by the way the Minister talked about the letter. First he said that it is an important letter and discussed the circumstances which led to discovery of the letter. We put only a simple question as to what the names of those Rajya Sabha Members are. First he said, "I have no time for this." Then he said, "All right, I will." Then he mentioned one number. Immediately it was found that the number did not tally with the name of the Member. The Member is saying that he has not signed it. Then he is not prepared to give other numbers ...(*Interruptions*)... Why did he say that? Why can't he tell about the other numbers? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: He is talking of a letter. ...(*Interruptions*)... Even bogus voting took place in this great Parliament. That is the problem today.

SHRI B. P. SINGHAL: Sir, in order to avoid this controversy, I would request you to give a ruling that whenver any Minister receive a letter from a Member of Parliament, then he must get it authenticated by the Member concerned. If 40 Members have signed a letter, all the 40 Members should authenticate, it before any action is to be taken on it. I request you to give such a ruling. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, if I understood correctly, the hon. Minister wanted to lay the letter on the Table of the House. You have permitted him and he is prepared to authenticate the letter. If I have understood correctly that was the position a few minutes before. Now, the question arises ...(*Interruptions*)... If I have heared the Minister correctly, he said that he is not quite sure whether all the signatures are genuine. Then on the basis what is he going to authtenticate? If he cannot authenticate a document, surely, he may not lay it on the Table of the House. All the papers which are to be laid on the Table of the House are to be authenticated. If you permit him to lay a paper on the Table of the House about which the Minister himself is not sure, then how can he lay it and how can he authenticate it? Therefore, my most respectful sbubmission would be that perhaps you cannot permit the Minister to lay it on the Table of the House. In the fitness of things, this matter must be sent to the investigating agency to determine the authenticity of the letter because the Minister himself has said that he is not quite sure whether all the signatures are genuine or not. ...(*Interruptions*)... I have no problem. Let him authenticate it. Let him place it on the Table of the House. You will have to face the music if some of the signatures are found to be forged. Therefor, to maintain the dignity of the House, you must recognise the fact that the letter be investigated whether it is a genuine letter or not. It is really intriguing that 40 Members are writing a letter on 12th January and it is reaching the Prime Minister's Office on 5th March.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Date is changed by hand.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Thereafter, when the Finance Minister enquired about the fate of the letter, nobody knows. Therefore, this matter must be clinched before he lays it on the Table of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, let me say. Mr. Virumbi, please, do not talk with him. The issue is, the hon. Minister got a letter. There were some signatures. Action was taken on this—a note was written by the Advisor. Later on, you got that copy of the letter from the Prime Minister's Office ...(*Interruptions*)... Let me complete. Why are you in a hurry? the question is, what I asked him to authenticate was the letter that he had received from the Prime Minister's

Office. That does not mean that he verified all those signatures. Let me say. He will authenticate the letter that he had received from the Prime Minister's Office. And, a very relevant point has been raised. It is a very serious point. He read it out. When Members asked him to read out the names of the Rajya Sabha Members who are there, he said, "RS number so and so." The hon. Member immediately felt hurt. It was natural for him to feel hurt. Now, we are in a situation that this verification, his authentication, is only with regard to the letter received. As far as the authentication of the signatures is that has to be sent to the proper agency to get it authenticated, whether they are genuine or not so that Members' names are cleared for the sake of the honour of this House.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I am grateful to you for your very, very lucid ruling on this subject. The only point that I was making was, all this about the sale of the ITC shares held by the UTI and the note which my advisor put upto me, was based on newspaper reports appearing about this letter. Because he says, very clearly, that he is basing this on newspaper reports. Now, therefore, as far as this charge is concerned, namely, the sale of ITC here held by the UTI, I would say, with all emphasis at my command, that there was absolutely no proposal either at that time, or, there is absolutely no proposal at this time, for the sale of those shares. And, in any case, it is not the intention of the Government, in the Ministry of Finance, to interfere with the commercial business decsions of the UTI. I am for the autonomy of the financial institutions and these judgements must be left to them.

Then I come to the second point, namely, the other issue, whether, according to Mr. Guruswamy,—Mr. Arun Shourie referred to it—there was a suggestion of some unethical impropriety or ethical impropriety. He said, "This is about the fixation of referral price or the floor price of certain categories of steel." I remember, Sir, there was a question– I think, it was Question Number 1 on that day. It was last Monday. My colleague, hon. the Minister of Steel, reminds me of the question which he was answering in this very House on the fixation of the floor price. He answered this question to the satisfaction of the Members for about half-an-hour giving very cogent and clear reasons why the Government thought it fit to fix those floor prices. Now, I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition because when he was speaking, he said that it was not his case, it cannot be anybody's case, that we should allow Indian industry, and that too an industry like the steel industry, to go down under as a result of unfair competition from imports from abroad.

6.00 P.M.

Fair competition, one is willing to put up with. But, in unfair competition the Government has a role, a responsibility and a duty. Now, Sir, it is well known that Indian industry is facing problems. They have been facing problems for some time now and some of the critical sectors of industry which have been facing more problems, than the others are steel, cement, commercial vehicles, paper, capital goods etc. I had received representations from various industry associations, Chamber of Commerce, saying that these industries were facing problems and that Government should do something. Sir, early September, I think, it was 4th of September, if I am not mistaken, the hon'ble Minister of Steel led a delegation of the entire steel industry consisting of the public sector and the private sector. He came to me and they made a very, very cogent strong case for some action on the part of the Government to help the Indian steel industry especially in our country from cheaper imports. After this, Sir, in October, I appointed an inter-Ministerial Committee to go into the problems of the steel industry. That inter-Ministerial Committee had two meetings and after

that they submitted their report. I am saying this, on my authority, that that inter-Ministerial Committee did not recommend any prices. Now, see, how the whole case is being built up. Mr. Mohan Guruswamy repeatedly in his article, in the question that he has answered to the Members of this hon'ble House, has said, how it is that for HR coils, the price recommended was 247 dollars a tonne, and it was raised by the three of us here to 302 dollars, it was recommended at 247 and we raised it to 302—the Minister of Steel, the Minister of Commerce and the Finance Minister. Why?—because, Mr. Mohan Guruswamy says, the Committee recommended only 24 and let the three Ministers explain how this price is raised to 302. I am saying, Sir, with all the emphasis at my command that that Committee did not recommend a price, much less a price of 24 dollars. It made a series of recommendations in regard to various other issues on which we have taken a decision. But, subsequently, the Ministry of Steel approached the Ministry of Commerce with a recommendation for fixing floor prices. This is exactly what my colleague, the Minister of Steel said in the House on that day that they looked at the figures of a few months, five months or six months of the London Metal Bulletin, not Exchange. 'London Metal Bulletin prices'. They looked at the price of Japan; they looked at the price of European producers and that they fixed the floor price for HR coil at 302 dollars per tonne, as it indeed fixed the prices of various other steel products at various levels. The Minister of Steel informs me, Sir, that in February, last month, the Americans have taken a similar action and they have fixed the HR coil floor price at 310 dollars from Russia. Now, the hon'ble Leader of the Opposition, I have no quarrel with him, said, "We should protect the Indian industry". This is exactly what we are trying to do. Now, if you calculate that from some other sources, if HR coils were coming at, let us say, 200 dollars, then the difference is 102 dollars. 102 dollars converted into rupees is this much. The total quantity produced in this country is so much. And all this quantity has been already sold. Therefore, a figure is arrived at, a figure of Rs. 5,000 crores or so. it is not Mohan Guruswamy speaking. I had intervened when the Leader of the Oposition was making that point. In his interview in "THE INDIAN EXPRESS", Mr. Mohan Guruswamy was asked a pointed question: Does it amount to Rs. 5,000 crores? He has not answered that question. He is not making that allegation.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Yesterday, you asked me that question. If what you have done is to fix the floor price and if the floor price has been fixed at the level of $302, when the recommended price was $247, I say with all the sense of responsibility that the extra, undeserved gain to the producers would be Rs. 5,000 crores. I say so for the following reasons. The latest figure I have seen for the finished steel production in our country is about 23 million tonnes. If you ban the import of steel below a certain price and the figure that you fix is $50 higher than what was recommended, you are raising the minimum saleable price of steel in our country by $50 a tonne. You multiply $50 by 23.5 million tonnes. You get the figure of Rs. 5,000 crores. .... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I said, "Some figure can be arrived at." But I made it very very clear, as clear as I could, to this House that that the Inter-Ministerial Committee did not recommend it. Where is the question?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: If you were fixing the floor price, what was the recommendation of the Inter-Ministerial Group? Was it the fixation of the referral price, as Mr. Jitendra Prasada asked, or was it the fixation of a floor price? The two things are very different.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: My short point is: Is there any

recommendation regarding the floor price? Secondly, is it true that the floor price recommended was lower than what was fixed? Thirdly, is it true that the floor price was not fixed with regard to Kazhak steel? Why? Is it true that no floor price was decided about Kazhak steel?

SHRI NAVEEN PATNAIK: The hon. Member knows that it is the Director General of Foreign Trade in the Commerce Ministry who fixes these prices. The Anti Dumping Authority in the Commerce Ministry decided last year to fix the price of $245, a blanket price to stop cheap imports from Ukrain and Russia.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: That is the point. Why was it not fixed for Kazhak steel?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him complete. Why don't you let him complete? let him complete.

SHRI NAVEEN PATNAIK: The hon. Member may please be patient with me for two minutes.

This price of $245 was to control the cheap imports of Russian and Ukrainian hot rolled items. This was $245 FOB. With CIF price, it becomes, I think, $259. This was calculated on the cost of production of 1996-97 which were a year older. I am sure, the hon. Member, so distinguished, knows that in one year prices rise further. After that, in September, 98 when I led a delegation of the public sector and private sector enterprises to the Finance Minister, he set up under the Special Secretary in the Finance Ministry, the Vasudevji committee, which came to decide, among other things, to improve the lot of the steel sector. We could also have a floor price. Checking with the London Metal Bulletin, the most reputed document on the subject of prices in May, June and July, and taking a rational price, in October, after taking everything into account a price of $302 was suggested.

Sir, if I may be permitted to make a comparison, I would say that while the consumption of steel in India is 20 kilogram per head year, in America it is 400 kilograms. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please be patient for half a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why can't you hear him? Let him complete his answer.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I would like to know the relevance of the consumption of steel to this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can ask question after he completes.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, it is not Question Hour. The Minister must be on the point.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, the question is who determines the floor price? Whether it is the Minister or the...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please speak one by one....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, he has reduced the debate to an absolute mockery. In protest we are walking out of the House....*(Interruptions)*...

(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber.)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Your case is a fractured one. That is why you don't want to listen....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Sir, we want to listen to the Minister.

SHRI NAVEEN PATNAIK: Sir, may I carry on with the point that I was making before the interruptions? I was saying after we recommended the floor price of 302 dollars last October to the Commerce Ministry, they deliberated, as they have the option on these matters. And in December, the Director General of Foreign Trade under the Commerce Ministry, announced the price of 302 dollars for HR coils. Sir, before the hon. Members left the House, I was making a point that while in India, the consumption of steel is 20 kilogram per head, it is 400 kilogram per head in

America. These are approximate figures. America, recently in February, fixed up a floor price of steel to approximately 310 dollars in respect of hot-rolled coils to be imported from Russia. Now, Sir, you can see the difference in the consumption level between the two countries. If they can protect their steel industry, why should we not protect ours? ...*(Interruptions)*...Let me complete....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM: There are so many points; not only steel....*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly, let him complete.

SHRI NAVEEN PATNAIK: The point that I am trying to make is that if, in America, they can have a price of approximately 310 dollars, we too can have a price of 302 dollars. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I have a point to make. My point is...*(Interruptions)*...Please allow me to make my point....*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have permitted him to speak first. Both of you are standing together.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: We found out that there was a suggestion for a lower floor pricce....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASWANT SINHA: No. ...*(Interruptions)*...Why is he repeating it? He is misleading the House. No. It is not. It is not true. I am denying it. I think he is repeating it. He is misleading the House. There was no suggestion...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Just now, the hon. Minister of Steel said that one year back the price suggested was $245. This is what the hon. Minister has said. ...*(Interruptions)*...The whole steel industry in the world is going through a recession. There is no increase in price. therefore, even if it was decided one year back, it is quite realistic this year also. This is one point.

SHRI YASWANT SINHA: Sir, is he going to make another speech? Why shouldn't I...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I have to put the question. Why was no floor price fixed for Kazhak steel? Is it because Mittal is the owner of the Kazhak steel project? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That point you have already made.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: why was it not fixed for Kazhak steel? Kazhak steel was exported to India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That point you have already made.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I am on a point of submission.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am only saying while fixing the floor price, why was the Kazhak steel left out?...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already made that point.

SHRI YASWANT SINHA: The floor price was fixed for all imported steel...*(Interruptions)*...No. You are wrong. It was fixed for imported steel...*(Interruptions)*...You are absolutely wrong.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a submission to make. When the hon. Minister of Steel wanted to say something, my senior colleague and the senior-most Member of this House, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, said, "It is not Question Hour. Come to the subject. We don't want to hear anything." He himself raised the question. I honourably, politely submit to the Chair that when the Minister is in the middle of giving his response—he is still giving the reply—no member is allowed, authorised to disrupt him and to divert the debate. I request you to allow the Minister to reply. Let him ccomplete' his reply. Afterwards, if, still, they have any doubts, they can seek clarifications....*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, Please, Please, Please, Please, Please, Please, Please, no questions. No. qustions. No questions. No questions. ...*(Interruptions)*...Please sit down. After the Minister completes his reply, I will certainly give you a chance for seeking clarifications. But let him complete his speech first.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): Sir, clarifications on what Mr. Guruswamy has said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only on Guruswamy.

SHRI YASWANT SINHA: Sir, I was on the question of floor price. Therefore, to recapitulate, I would say a specific floor price for various products of steel was not reccommended by the committee. Therefore, it is not right to say that as far as the H.R, coils are concerned, the committee has recommended a price of $247, which the Minister has raised it to $302. It was not an interministerial meeting. I never had a meeting with my colleague, the Commerce Minister. I never had a meeting with my colleague, the Minister of Steel....*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Somebody in the Government has fixed the price...*(Interruptions)*...We are not satisfied with this reply. As a protest, we walk-out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber.)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamilnadu): When we are enquiring about the steel manufactured in India, the Minister of Finance is replying about the American steel. The Finance Minister is contradicting the Minister of Steel. This is not the reply the Opposition have sought for. As a protest, we also walk-out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber.)

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: You could not puncture the reply. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is why you are staging a walkout ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. Minister complete his reply. ...*(Interruptions)*... Now, nothing. Let him complete.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, in the interview which Shri Mohan Guruswamy gave to *The Indian Express* on the 23rd February, this question was pointedly put to him; and the questioner said:

"This allowed local mills to boost prices of their products and according to users, amounts to a total give-away of Rs. 5000 crores"; to which, Shri Guruswamy replied, "I was present in just a couple of meetings of the Inter-Ministerial Committee looking at ways to help the steel industry which was being hurt, etc., etc.". He does not answer this question. But I am saying, on record, again with all the emphasis at my command, that Shri Mohan Guruswamy never attended a single meeting of the Inter-Ministerial Committee. So the question of his being present in just two meetings does not arise. The Committee held only two meetings and then gave its report.

Now, much was made—the Opposition benches are empty—of the question 'Where did this Rs. 5000 crores go?'. It went because, as Shri Guruswamy said, there were State elections also coming up at that time. A very pregnant sentence! State elections are coming and this Rs. 5000 crores went! Very meaningful, very plausible! But the floor prices were fixed in the middle of December and the elections to the State Assemblies were over on the 25th of November! He says the State elections were coming and so we did it.

SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR (MAHARASHTRA): In our language, we call it *suppressio veri, suggestio falsi.*

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The other point which has been raised by Dr.

Manmohan Singh was this. He was saying, "What is the style of governance of this Government? Are we taking decisions on behalf of the financial institutions? Did we try and help a particular steel company?" Sir, the answer to that is, as I said, the entire steel industry is facing problems. We have taken a number of steps to help the steel industry. The steel industry is doing a little better today than it was doing previously. And Sir, a lot of money of the financial institutions, thousands of crores of rupees, are locked up as advances as exposure to the steel sector. It is not in national interest either to allow the steel sector to go down or to allow the financial institutions to go down. As the Finance Minister, it is my responsibility to ensure that these advances to the steel sector, this exposure of the financial institutions to the steel sector, does not turn into NPAs as a result of the problems, world problems, which have impacted on the Indian steel industry also. Already 15 per cent of this has turned into NPAs. I am concerned because it is public money. Therefore, I had authorised my Adviser to call a meeting of the financial institutions on the 4th January so that we could discuss in general issues which were involved in the steel sector. And such a meeting was indeed held. I have checked up. The financial institutions first met in the IDBI office. Then they subsequently met in the room of my Adviser and then they came to my room. Now, a big noise is being made as if this whole exercise was meant to help one steel unit. And, if Mr. Guruswamy is to be believed, he has said that that particular company is a very good company; it has done a lot of good work; and that the terms which the financial institution were thinking of were very, very stringent. Mr. Amar Singh was speaking here in this House. He said that on the 18th—today, it is the 15th March—on the 18th March, there is going to be a meeting in the IDBI and such and such decisions are going to be taken. I must confess that he is better informed about what is going on than I am because I do not know what the IDBI Board is going to decide, what the financial institutions are going to decide on the 18th of March. And the Government is not at all willing to interfere with the functioning of the financial institutions. The IDBI, according to my information, has appointed a four member-Committee; that four-member Committee is going into this. They will make their recommendations. The IDBI is the lead institution and the IDBI lead will then be followed by all the institutions. But the Government has no intention of interfering with the decision of the IDBI, and I am saying on record here, in this House, that when reports started appearing in the media, especially in the print media, that the Ministry was trying to help one particular firm or was interfering with the decision-making process, I called up the Chairman of the IDBI personally and told him that the Ministry had absolutely no business to put any pressure on their judgement the Ministry would not like to influence the judgement and that the institution should take their own decision in the matter. What decision they are going to take on 18th, I am not going to interfere with that. I am going to leave it entirely to the institutions to decide in what manner they should save the steel industry and save their own exposure in the steel industry. So, all this talk about helping a particular steel industry, doing this and that, is absolutely untrue, Sir, and is not a fact at all. Now, these were the three issues which Dr. Manmohan Singh had raised. Mr. Guruswamy had raised a number of issues. Some of them had been raised by some other Members of this House.

Now, I come to the question of Tata Airlines. It is a well-known fact that the Tata Airlines withdrew their own application. They did not give this Government a chance to come to a conclusion, and this is a matter which has been debated, as has been pointed out, repeatedly in this House and in the other House. So, I don't have to take your time. But I

would like to say that as far as I am concerned, this matter never came up to me. I had no occasion to express as opinion in regard to the Tata Airlines case. It was with the Foreign Investment promotion Board. It was pending with the Foreign Investment Promotion Board when the Tatas decided to withdraw their proposal. Therefore, to say that I was in favour of this, and I was repeatedly speaking to the Prime Minister, I can only say, is not correct. I have never spoken even once to the Prime Minister about the Tata Airlines case. It was in the FBIP of which Mr. Mohan Guruswamy was not a member, and if I was not in the know of the things, then how as my advisor, he was more in the know of things than I was.

He has also raised the issue of Enron and much has been made by Members of this House about the forty per cent ceiling being breached in the case of Enron. Sir, I am saying it again with all the emphasis at my command that no norms have been breached. Enron has been financed on the basis of well laid down norms and the exposure of the financial institutions is less that fifteen per cent--direct exposure—at this point of time. But I would like to inform the House that for various very valid reasons, this Government has decided to do away in September, 1998 with the forty per cent ceiling. We have decided to do away with the forty per cent ceiling because it was acting against the interest of Indian producers and Indian suppliers, and in order to promote the Indian producers and Indian suppliers, we have decided to do away with that ceiling. Therefore, no norms have been violated as far as Enron financing is concerned.

Then he has raised a question about the GE-Capital. As Mr. Chaturvedi was saying, Sir, GE-Capital was not brought into this country by our Government. GE-Capital was allowed to do business, was given a licence to do business in this country in the financial sector in 1993, and since 1993 they have been doing business in this country. Since 1993, they have been advanced monies by the financial institutions of this country, according to their own best judgement. Now, in 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98, if monies were advanced by the financial institutions, nothing wrong took place. But if the financial institutions, in their judgement, has advanced some monies to GE-Capital in 1998-99, then how does it become a sin? How was it not a sin before? How suddenly, it becomes a sin now. I am unable to understand this thing. I would like to say that no RBI norms have been violated, no SEBI norms have been violated in the financing of GE-Capital by the financial institutions.

I am going by the same logic which the Leader of the Opposition has admitted, that it is not our business to sit in judgement over the judgment of the financial institutions, it is not our business to interfere in their day-to-day functioning. We have not interfered with their relationship with GE-Caps, and it was not our intention to interfere with them in the past, and in future also, Sir.

Now, he has raised a question of Maruti Udyog. Maruti Udyog is, again, something which has been discussed in this House. It was not this Government which sold the shares that the Government held in Maruti Udyog. It was the previous Government; they brought it to 50:50, and it is absolutely wrong to say that we have surrendered any of the rights of the Government of India as a share-holder in Maruti. But much has been made of this.

Now, Sir, as far as the Vizag power plant is concerned, the Vizag power plant is a fast-track power plant. Who had devised the policy of fast-track power plants? It was the Congress Government. When the Leader of the Opposition was the Finance Minister, this policy of fast-track power plants was constructed. The Hinduja power plant in Vizag was one of the eight fast-track power plants which

were selected, and the whole thing started then.

They were asking how a coal company was given such a guarantee. We have not given that guarantee. It was during the time of the previous Government, the United Front Government, that a Presidential directive was issued to the Mahanandi Coal Nigam Ltd. that they should bear the consequential damages for the supply of coal to the Hinduja power plant in Vizag. How are we concerned with that? Did they raise a question when the U.F. Government, which they were supporting, was in power? How all these questions are being raised now? It is true that we have gone ahead because we are a determined Government, we want to solve the power situation in the country, and, therefore, we have gone ahead, and we are trying to see that these power companies, which were on the fast track, do complete their financial project, and we have signed a counter-guarantee agreement, but we have not gone out of the way, in any manner, to help the Hindujas, and it is absolutely wrong to say that the guarantee which the coal company has given, or the guarantee which the Railways has given, is something which is out of the way.

Sir, I come to crony-capitalism. Much has been said about "crony-capitalism", and the fact that Shri Guruswamy was very hurt that India was indulging in crony-capitalism in Suhartoism, as he says; my colleague, Mr. Ram Jethmalani, has already explained, in great detail, what is the meaning of "Suhartoism" or "crony-capitalism". And let me say, with all the sense of responsibility that I have, that no Government can take India to "crony-capitalism" no Government and much less the BJP-led Government. This Government is determined to ensure that the Indian economy progresses along the right line, and we have done nothing in the last twelve months which even slightly bears a suggestion towards crony-capitalism or towards 'Suhartoism'. I do not know what Mr. Guruswamy has referred to by this, but I would like to refer to the interview that he has given, which appeared yesterday in the "Hindustan Times". He says, "Yashwant Sinha should speak his heart out. He has a chance to become a hero!" I am speaking my heart out. I am speaking my heart out, and, Sir, let me say one thing, again, with all the sincerity at my command, again, with all the sense of responsibility at my command, much has been said about the coterie around the Prime Minister; much has been said, Sir, in this House; his foster son-in-law has been commented upon. I think, nothing could have been as denigrating as that.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: And mean.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I am not using the word "mean" because I am not sure whether it is parliamentary.

But, Sir, I would like to say that if I have not received till date, till this moment, if I, as the Finance Minister of this country, have not received a single telephone call from the so-called foster son-in-law of the Prime Minister, shall I stand here and tell you an untruth and say, "I am under pressure?" Is that what my hon. friends from the Opposition would like me to say? But this is God's own truth. The truth is that I have never been under any pressure from either the Prime Minister's household, or, from the Prime Minister's Office in regard to any issue; in regard to any issue. But much is being made of this, that I am under pressure. He was saying that I am the Prime Minister's third choice. So, was he my Advisor at that time? How does he know that I was the third choice? What is the JPC that they want? Do they want the JPC to go into the fact and find out whether there are differences between Mr. Advani and Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee? Will that be a matter for a Joint Parliamentary Committee to inquire? Do they want a JPC because they want to find out whether I will be the first choice

of the Prime Minister, or, I will be the third choice of the Prime Minister for this post of Finance Minister? Do they want a JPC in order to find whether Mr. Pramod Mahajan went to the room of Mr. Guruswamy and met Mr. Pramod Mittal, or, that Mr. Pramod Mittal was sitting there before? What is it that this JPC will do? They are saying that we have no proof. They are saying, you supply us the proof. Why don't you give us the proof so that we could tell you? What an argument! I have been a Member of this House, and I have listened to many debates. I was present here and the whole House was absolutely jam-packed. Every Member was present when we were discussing the Bofors issue in this House. I have seen many debates in this House. But, I am saying with a great deal of sorrow and a great deal of sadness, rarely have I witnessed, rarely have I participated in so farcical a debate that we started on Saturday. Never once; never once. And with all due respect to the hon. Members of the Opposition who have chosen to walk out because they could not stand the searing truth. They could not stand being burnt by the truth with which they were confronted. So, they have walked out. Let me say, Sir, there is absolutely no truth in the allegations. There is absolutely no case for a JPC. And with all due respect, Sir, I would say that this has been a total waste of time. Perhaps this debate should never have taken place. Thank you very much.

SHRI R. MARGABANDU: Sir, we demand a CBI inquiry. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not permitted you. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamilnadu): Sir, you had permitted it in the morning. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I have not permitted it. (*Interruptions*). I have not permitted anybody. (*Interruptions*) Please go back. (*Interruptions*). No, no. (*Interruptions*). I have not permitted anybody. No, no. (*Interruptions*). Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, please move the Motion. (*Interruptions*). I have not permitted. (*Interruptions*). I have not permitted. (*Interruptions*). Please go back to your seats. (*Interruptions*). No, no. (*Interruptions*). Nothing will go on record. (*Interruptions*). Shri Gurudas Das Gupta. (*Interruptions*). Nothing will go on record. (*Interruptions*). Nothing will go on record. (*Interruptions*).... Nothing will go on record. (*Interruptions*)... Nothing will go on record. (*Interruptions*).... Nothing will go on record. (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta is to move the Resolution disapproving of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Repeal Ordinance, 1999. (*Interruptions*)... Nothing will go on record. (*Interruptions*)....

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE URBAN LAND (CEILING AND REGULATION) REPEAL ORDINANCE, 1999

II. THE URBAN LAND (CEILING AND REGULATION) REPEAL BILL, 1999.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

> "That this House disapproves of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Repeal Ordinance, 1999 (No. 5 of 1999) promulgated by the President on the 11th January, 1999."

Sir, my point is that the Government is deliberately enacting a legislation which will lead to land speculation in the country.

[The Vice-Chairman, Shri T.N. Chaturvedi *in the chair*]

If the present Oridnance is allowed to be passed by the House, it will lead to a speculative rise in the price of urban land. It will lead to grabbing of the most important part of the urban land by the business houses. It will lead to the middle class losing their landed property. It will